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Reviewer's report:

An excellent study although the level set for low BP is normal range - I'm not sure why that was selected and it would be good if that was explained in methods. This is described appropriately in main text as 'low or normal' but needs describing as such in abstract too.

Reference 3 is outdated and not specific to inpatient falls - the economic impact assessment appendix to NICE CG 161 is an alternative.

Page 4 line 7

"This highlights the importance of a medication review in both the primary and secondary prophylaxis of falls" - 'prevention' more typically used than 'prophylaxis'

Page 6 line 16

"Finally, only patients that were prescribed antihypertensive medications in accordance with the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidance" - I think this is intended to mean 'antihypertensive medications as defined by NICE guidance' - and needs to include reference to which NICE guidance (hypertension not falls I assume)
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