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We thank the Reviewers for their thoughtful review. As suggested, we performed a revision of our manuscript. We hope that the revised version has significantly improved the manuscript.

Please, find below our point-by-point responses to the comments and queries raised by the Editor.

Editorial comments:

Comment 1: Please remove the supplementary file called "Consent for publication". Consent for publication refers to consent for the publication of identifying images or other personal or
clinical details of participants that compromise anonymity. Seeing as this is not applicable to your manuscript please state “Not Applicable” in this section.

This correction was made.

Comment 2: Please remove this text from the title page: Running head: Decreased risk of falls in patients attending music sessions on an acute; geriatric ward; Abstract: 350; Words: 2319; Tables: 3; Figures: 0; References: 39

This correction was made. Please see the modification on page 4.

Comment 3: Please change the "Retrospectively registered study" heading to "Trial Registration". Please change the statement to "Clinical trial registry: ClinicalTrials.gov. Registration number: NCT03348657 (November 17th, 2017). Retrospectively registered".

This correction was made. Please see the modification on page 4.

Comment 4: Please clarify whether your study was prospective or retrospective. We note you have stated that it was retrospective, but the entire Methods section reads like it was prospective. If it was retrospective, who or from where was the data acquired from. This needs to be stated in the "Methods" and "Availability of data and materials" sections. It currently states that the data was acquired from one of the authors of this current study, which again, implies that this is a prospective study.

This was a retrospective cohort study. The data was acquired via a chart review of the patients who were admitted to the geriatric assessment unit of St. Mary’s Hospital Center (Montreal, Quebec, Canada) between October 2014 and May 2016.

This was clarified in the methods sections. Please refer to the modifications on page 6 and 14.

Comment 5: Please clarify whether the participants original consented to be part of the trial, and whether this was written or verbal. If verbal, was this approved by the ethics committee. Please include this information in the Ethics approval and consent to participate section.

As this was a retrospective study, written or verbal consent from the participants was not obtained. Please note that the study was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of St. Mary’s Hospital Center (SMHC #14-31).
Please refer to the modification made on page 8.

Comment 6: We have noted that some of the participants had neuropsychiatric disorders, who consented on behalf of these participants for their participation in the trial. Please include this information in the Ethics approval and consent to participate section.

Please refer to the response of comment 5 above.