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Reviewers report:

This research conducted a secondary analysis to examine the cost-effectiveness of a multifactorial community-based fall prevention program for two different age groups: 75-84 years and 85+ years. The manuscript reads well and I only have a few minor comments to be addressed.

Background

Page 3, para 2, line 27 - The ultimate goal of a fall injury prevention program would be to prevent falls. This text needs to be modified; such as the goal would be to reduce fall risk factors, prevent falls and fall-related use of health services, and maintain quality of life.

Page 3, para 2, line 41 - I'd suggest that the suitability or appeal of the intervention to the participants would also need to be considered.

Page 3, para 3, line 58 and Page 4, para 2, line 27 - should be 'cost effective', not effectiveness.

Para 4, para 1, line 1 - should be 'community-dwelling' rather than 'patient' subgroups.

Methods

Page 6, para 1, line 24 - suggest 'daily fall status'.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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