Reviewer’s report

Title: Identifying Protective and Risk Factors for Injurious Falls in Patients Hospitalized for Acute Care: A Retrospective Case-Control Study

Version: 0 Date: 12 Apr 2017

Reviewer: Pamela Hawranik

Reviewer's report:

The authors are studying an important problem and provide a very good background to support the importance of this research. There have been many studies examining risk factors for falls, however multiple risk factors have been identified, which creates problems for staff in identifying which patient is actually at great risk of injury from falling. The authors decide to examine the predictors of 'injurious' falls in an acute care setting. By being more specific, more effective strategies and better use of resources can occur to help prevent these types of falls. There are a few gaps in the explanation of the methodology that I feel need to be clarified.

-- define 'injurious' falls at the beginning of the paper. It was unclear until the results section what is meant by 'injurious' -- whether bruising or fractures,...

-- it is not clear what the exclusion criteria was for the cases or the control group. It appears that the controls could have fallen and some could have had an injurious fall, is this correct? If so, how many of the controls had injurious falls?

-- the power analysis needs to be more specific the analysis and the conclusions drawn from the data are appropriate. The authors provide implications of their results which is explained well.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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