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**Author’s response to reviews:**

Dear Dr Tu,

Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript again. We greatly appreciate your insightful comments, which have helped us to further improve this paper considerably. Our responses to the comments are presented below. We hope that the revised manuscript is now suitable for publication.

**Technical Comments:**

1. Please provide all authors' emails on title page.

We provide all authors' emails in this revised manuscript.

2. Declarations: "Consent to publish", please state "Not applicable".

We state "Not applicable" in consent to publish.
3. Declarations: "Authors’ Contributions", "and SA, KY, TO, ST, HM, RA and KT have given final approval of the version to be published." should be "All authors read and approved the final manuscript."

We changed it as you suggested.

4. "The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Keio University School of Medicine. The name of the ethics committee that approved the study was the Ethics Committee of the Keio University School of Medicine. The committee’s reference number is #2010293." could be simplified as "The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Keio University School of Medicine (Reference Number #2010293)."

Thank you very much. We have addressed these technical comments.

Reviewer reports:

Ivano Riva, MD (Reviewer 1): Revised paper reads well and rebuttal letter is satisfactory. Only minor adjustments before publication:

Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript again.

1. As previously stated, avoid mathematical formulae in the abstract. The passage: "The optimal regression model for patients' baseline fear of falling (+) = -7.0 + 0.062 x age + 0.58 x female - 0.088 x mean of total deviation values in the inferior peripheral VF + 0.87 x number of previous falls. The optimal regression equation for future fear of falling was: future fear of falling (+) = -6.2 + 0.068 x age + 0.77 x female - 0.058 x mean of total deviation values in the inferior peripheral VF + 0.83 x number of previous falls" is difficult to understand at first reading. Moreover, meaning of "baseline fear of falling (+)" and "future fear of falling (+)" is unclear. Please report your results in an argumentative way (example: "The best model predicting baseline fear of falling included age, gender, etc…")

Thank you very much. We have edited the abstract following this suggestion.

3. The meaning of "0.58 x female" and "0.77 x female" in the equation remains unclear. Equations of linear models have coefficients and variables. For example:

\[ y = c \times x \]

Where \( c \) is the coefficient and \( x \) is the variable (continuous/categorical). Which mathematical value has to be given to "female"? Is it a fixed number?

The formulae are now described, as suggested. As now added in the Result, ‘female’ and ‘male’ was assigned the value of 1 and 0, respectively.
4. English revision needed.

This manuscript has been proof-read by a native English speaker and revisions made.