# Peer Review Report

# Review Report on IMPROVING POLICY FOR THE PREVENTION OF FALLS AMONG COMMUNITY-DWELLING OLDER PEOPLE - A REVIEW AND QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF INTERNATIONAL NATIONAL AND STATE LEVEL PUBLIC POLICY

Review, Int J Public Health

## EVALUATION

**Q 1** **Please summarize the main theme of the review.**

Thank you for inviting me to review this study that investigated policies relevant to falls to identify gaps to guide future policy. I read it with great interests and excitement. This manuscript was written very well. I like the analysis presented. However, I have some concerns.

**Q 2** **Please highlight the limitations and strengths.**

I think the authors did a great job on organizing the manuscript and presenting the results.

However, I think the manuscript has two major limitations.

1. My major concerns is the language. As the authors already pointed out in the limitation section, they included articles written in English. However, for example, Japan, Korea, and Taiwan might not have policy in English. This leads to a great bias because the analysis of gaps and strengths of the current policy would be inaccurate.

2. The title shows that the focus is on community, but the authors incorporate several action plans at national level. I wonder if this type of policy should be included. In fact, there are several policy briefs that are more relevant at community level, but was not included in the list (e.g., https://www.idph.iowa.gov/Portals/1/userfiles/32/2018%20Falls%20brief.pdf or https://www.duke-nus.edu.sg/docs/librariesprovider3/research-policy-brief-docs/predictors-of-falls-among-older-singaporeans.pdf?sfvrsn=e8b838ae_0). So, I wonder if the search of the policies was exhausted.

**Q 3** **Please provide your detailed review report to the authors, structured in major and minor comments.**

I think the authors did a great job on organizing the manuscript and presenting the results.

However, I think the manuscript has two major limitations.

1. My major concerns is the language. As the authors already pointed out in the limitation section, they included articles written in English. However, for example, Japan, Korea, and Taiwan might not have policy in English. This leads to a great bias because the analysis of gaps and strengths of the current policy would be inaccurate.

2. The title shows that the focus is on community, but the authors incorporate several action plans at national level. I wonder if this type of policy should be included. In fact, there are several policy briefs that are more relevant at community level, but was not included in the list (e.g., https://www.idph.iowa.gov/Portals/1/userfiles/32/2018%20Falls%20brief.pdf or https://www.duke-

nus.edu.sg/docs/librariesprovider3/research-policy-brief-docs/predictors-of-falls-among-older-singaporeans.pdf?sfvrsn=e8b838ae_0). So, I wonder if the search of the policies was exhausted.

## PLEASE COMMENT

**Q 4** ▸ **Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?**

Yes

**Q 5** ▸ **Does this manuscript refer only to published data? (unpublished data is not allowed for Reviews)**

Yes.

**Q 6** ▸ **Does the manuscript cover the issue in an objective and analytical manner**

Yes.

**Q 7** ▸ **Was a review on the issue published in the past 12 months?**

No.

**Q 8** ▸ **Does the review have international or global implications?**

The review is limited due to the language barrier.

**Q 9** ▸ **Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?**

The title is OK, but the contents do not reflect much on the community level but at national level.

**Q 10** ▸ **Are the keywords appropriate?**

Yes

**Q 11** ▸ **Is the English language of sufficient quality?**

I think the authors write very well.

**Q 12** ▸ **Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?**

Yes.

## QUALITY ASSESSMENT

**Q 13** ▸ **Quality of generalization and summary**

**Q 14** Significance to the field

**Q 15** Interest to a general audience

**Q 16** Quality of the writing

## REVISION LEVEL

**Q 17** Please take a decision based on your comments:

Reject.