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**General comments**

Studies about identifying risk factors for falls are important. The present study is thorough however not so easy to read with some linguistic errors, which is my main concern. The manuscript would benefit from a thorough language review. Another concern is how comparable the two groups are, which the authors address well in the discussion.

Please find my specific comments below:

**Title**

The title can probably be rewritten so that it better describes the study. For instance “Risk factors associated with visiting or not visiting the Accident & Emergency Department after a fall”. Major compulsory revision

**Abstract**

Well displayed. If possible, try to avoid abbreviations in abstract.

**Introduction**

Gives a good introduction to the topic. Please include a reference in the second paragraph of the introduction. Abbreviations should be explained the first time it is used (A&E and WHO). Minor essential revision

**Aim**

The aim is somewhat vague – the sentence is long and hard to understand. It also seems that the authors’ wants to study risk factors in two different populations, but in the results, differences between the two groups are also displayed. Major compulsory revision

**Methods**

The method-section is accurate written but not so easy to follow. The last sentence in the second paragraph on page 4 should be moved to page 5, first paragraph, where other ethical concerns are displayed. Please explain all abbreviations the first time they are used (CTI, FOF, WMA). Please describe which descriptive statistic that is used. Major compulsory revision

**Results**
It would be easier to understand which patients who are included in the study, if the information in the first paragraph in results was followed by a flow chart.

Major compulsory revision

Tables and figures

The heading of table 1 should include information about the p-value. “General characteristics of the participants and p-value for the differences between the groups”. N=1094 is not necessary in the heading. In table 2 and 3 information about “p<0.05” is not necessary, the readers can see that by themselves. Minor essential revision

Figure 1: A 3D diagram is not so easy to read, 2D is better. Minor essential revision

Discussion

I think you should start the discussion with the second paragraph instead! That is the most important finding of your study. Minor essential revision

Both limitations and strengths of the study are well addressed.

Conclusion

Seems to be missing, however is present in the abstract, please add in the end of discussion also. Major compulsory revision
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