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Reviewer's report:

The authors have addressed nearly all the comments made by the reviewer appropriately. Nevertheless, one issue needs to be addressed:

Under 26 The reviewer wonders why international recommendation for fall prevention are not cited here (e.g. Sherrington et al., 2016 or Gillespie et al., 2012), as these international recommendation are setting the frame in other health care systems, and should be acknowledged.

Gillespie et al 2012 is referenced in the introduction. We have not referenced these recommendations in the discussion because the intervention is not solely a falls prevention intervention. We feel that to add this would add to the confusion surrounding the focus of the intervention.

The authors stated under point 25 that their first outcome are falls.

This does not fit together. Again, the reviewer would caution the authors to implement a short fall intervention as many research has already demonstrated failed success.

If the authors a taking falls as a primary outcome their intervention should follow international recommendation regarding this point.
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?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

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

No

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
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