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Reviewer's report:

Thank you very much for the invitation to peer review the manuscript entitled "Developing an Intervention for Fall-Related Injuries in Dementia (DIFRID)". The authors developed a complex intervention aimed to reduce fall-related injuries in people with dementia. An appropriate framework and a range of appropriate methods were used. The results of the developing steps are described detailed and are supported by a bunch of additional files. However, the description of the final intervention is somehow rudimentary. The manuscript is comprehensive, but might benefit from a more concise description of the preliminary development stages and a more pronounced discussion section.

Abstract

In the methods section the employment of observation is mentioned, but the main manuscript does not report on the observation anymore. Was the observation part of the study? On the other hand, the effectiveness review is not mentioned in the abstract, but discussed in the main text.

The results section might benefit from a data presentation following the single methodological steps. No information on the participants enrolled in the single methodological steps is presented. The authors mention that a number of modifications have been made after two rounds of Delphi surveys. The authors should briefly comment on the modifications.

Trial registration: Please add the date of registration.
Background

In line 20, evidence from interventions preventing accidental falls in older people without dementia is reported, but the cited papers (6,7) deal with patients with cognitive impairment.

Methods

On page 6, line 52 semi-structured interviews and focus groups are mentioned. The authors refer to an unpublished manuscript. The authors should therefore provide some more details on the content of the semi-structured interviews, e.g. was an interview guide used?

On page 10, section Stakeholder feedback: What was the reason for conducting additional stakeholder feedback interviews, when stakeholder were already involved in the Delphi survey? Where are the results of the stakeholder feedback interviews reported in the manuscript?

On page 10, line 55, a Programme Management Group is mentioned. What was the role of this group?

Results

Overall, the results on the intervention development should be presented in a more concise manner.
Results are reported according to the emerging themes. This approach provides a good overview about modifications during the process regarding the themes, but in some points, it is difficult to identify from which source (Delphi survey or Stakeholder feedback) the given information is drawn.

Information on the characteristics of the final intervention should be part of the results section. Information on the "dosage" of the intervention components is sometimes missing, e.g. the duration of the staff training programme. In Additional file 6 and the interventions’ description, the differentiation between "what" should be implemented and "how" the intervention should be delivered is somehow weak. A checklist like the CICI framework generic checklist (https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-017-0552-5) might be helpful to be more clear in terms of intervention characteristics and implementation strategies.

Discussion

The discussion section is rather short. Although there are a number of studies, which use a comparable methodological approach or contribute to the body of evidence dealing with falls in people with dementia, the authors do not discuss their findings on the background of the existing evidence. The discussion of the finding should be embedded in the already existing bulk of evidence of studies dealing with fall prevention programmes für people with dementia.
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