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Reviewer's report:

The paper by Hongisto et al. focuses on the screening with IADL scale and MMSE test as potential predictors of institutionalization 1 year after hip fracture in a Finnish population.

The manuscript is overall well written, and the methods are stated clearly.

I have only minor revisions to suggest:

Page 3, line 22: The expression "due to the rapid growth in the population of older people" is quite uncommon; I suggest to rephrase it in order to make it more fluent.

Page 4, line 10: there is a missing space between "arrangements" and "1".

Page 4, line 19: I suggest to use "time-point" instead of "point in time".

Additionally, in the manuscript I suggest to use the expression "Patients' characteristics" instead of "patient characteristics", including the tables and captions. I suggest the same for "patients' age" (as in page 7, line 12).

Page 12, line 1: please use "this investigation" instead of "this study", in order to avoid the repetition immediately after.

Statistical revision: I suggest a statistical revision by an expert.

Language revision: not necessary.

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