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Author’s response to reviews:

September 3, 2019

Robin L. Cassady-Cain, Ph.D.
BMC Geriatrics

Re: Fall-Related Emergency Department Visits and Hospitalizations among Community-Dwelling Older Adults: Examination of Health Problems and Injury Characteristics (BGTC-D-18-00780R2)

Dear Dr. Cassady-Cain:

We appreciate Reviewer #2’s additional comments on our revised paper: (1) using a p-value cutoff of <0.05 that may increase type 1 error; and (2) need for improved discussion, specifically spending more time weaving the findings of the study into the discussion as well as other literature on the topic. Per your instruction, we provide our point-by-point responses to these comments in this cover letter as follows:
We provided a detailed response to Reviewer #1’s suggestion that we adjust p values in the first response to reviewers. In that response, we listed five reasons why we don’t believe that it is prudent to make these adjustments in the current paper. In addition, we added a sentence explaining our decision in the adjusting p values in the Data Analysis section. Reviewer #2 does not mention our response to Reviewer #1 or our revisions, so we are unclear if Reviewer #2 had the opportunity to see our response prior to this review. We again evaluated the possibility of p value adjustments and we again concluded that there was no obvious family of tests within which to adjust the p values, thus increasing the threat of Type II errors. While we have used p value adjustments in prior work, there were no obvious family-wise corrections necessary. Furthermore, we consider Tables 1 and 2 to be primarily descriptive and there is no obvious practical harm that would arise from these findings in the event of a Type I error. Finally, we would again point out that raw p values can easily be adjusted by a reader or a practitioner of meta analysis, but, reverse-engineering adjusted p values is dubious to impossible depending on the adjustment used.

Improved discussion section:

As shown in the highlighted sections of the Discussion section, we have expanded the Discussion section by citing more recent publications. (It has been several months since we submitted our revised paper to the BMC Geriatrics). We have also slightly reorganized the Discussion section to improve the logical flow. We believe the Discussion section is now solid/improved with these revisions.

We hope that these responses are satisfactory. Thank you, and we look forward to your decision.

Sincerely,

Namkee G. Choi, PhD

Corresponding author

The University of Texas at Austin