Paper: **"Evaluation of Fall Events and Fall Management Strategies in an Inpatient Care Facility"**

Corresponding Author: Arberesha Gurguri

Peer review:

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
The title is clear, accurate, and academically appropriate, but the author can make it slightly stronger. Like: Evaluation of Fall Events and Fall Management Strategies in an Inpatient Care Facility
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
The abstract is well-written, clearly structured, and addresses an important issue in geriatric nursing care. The topic is clinically relevant, and the results provide practical implications for fall prevention. However, several areas would benefit from clarification and strengthening to enhance scientific rigor and interpretability.
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
Overall, the manuscript is well-written and coherent, but several points require correction or refinement. These fall into these categories:
1. Minor grammatical errors
✓ Examples:
"Falls can lead to physical (such as fractures) and/or psychological consequences…"
→ Better: "Falls can lead to physical consequences (such as fractures) and/or psychological consequences…"
"The effects of a fall can impair the patient's independence and thus lead to a reduction in the quality of patient life…"
→ Should be: "…quality of life of patients…" or "…patients' quality of life…"
2.Citation formatting inconsistencies
✓ Issues:
Sometimes a comma is used incorrectly before the year:
Schoberer et al, 2012 → must be Schoberer et al., 2012
Missing commas after the authors:
Example: Campbell et al.,1989 → space needed: Campbell et al., 1989
Hyphens/dashes inconsistent with treatment days and rates (minor formatting issue).
3. Repetition
The paragraph repeats the Von Renteln-Kruse and Krause (2004) study twice with nearly identical information. A reviewer would flag this.
4. Word choice and phrasing
✓ Examples:
"situational constraints" is unclear. Better: "functional challenges" or "mobility-related challenges."
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
The Methods section provides a substantial amount of detail, but several areas require clarification, restructuring, and greater methodological precision to meet academic standards for transparency and reproducibility.
1. Study design and setting

• The phrasing is confusing:

"for orthopedics, internal medicine, and geriatrics, respectively, on a 45-bed geriatric ward"

This mixes multiple departments with a single geriatric ward and needs clearer structure.

• It is unclear whether all departments were analyzed, or only the geriatric ward.

Clarify:

• Which units were included?

• Whether falls from orthopedic patients were analyzed or only geriatric patients.

2. Study population

• The sample population included in the analysis is not clearly stated.

You provide total admissions but do not specify how many fallers were included in analysis here (the number appears in Results but should also be in Methods).

• The relationship between 55,614 geriatric patients and the fall protocols is unclear.

You mention orthopedic patients but later say fall protocols only came from geriatric wards.

Provide:

• The exact number of fall events included.

• The exact number of unique patients with falls.

• A clear statement that orthopedic patients were not included in the fall analysis (if that is the case).

3. Data collection:

• It is unclear whether data were extracted manually, through digital systems, or both.

• The phrase "evaluated in writing" is unclear.

Clarify:

• How data extraction was conducted (manual coding? electronic record review?).

• Who performed the extraction and whether data quality checks were done.

Overall:

The Methods section is broadly understandable, sufficiently detailed in many areas, and well-intentioned.

✔ Strengths

• Use of standardized fall protocols

• Clear timeframe

• Clear variables

• Appropriate descriptive design

✗ Areas needing improvement

• Ambiguity about which patient groups are actually analyzed

• Inconsistent description of sample population

• Lack of clarity in statistical procedures

• Overly long variable list without structure

• Methodological flow could be more systematic

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Clarity: High

Grammar/Spelling Errors: Minor (easily corrected)

Statistical/Data Consistency: Needs careful revision

Methodology Description: Mostly clear, minor clarifications needed

Conclusions: Accurate and supported

References: Comprehensive and appropriate

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusions are accurate, coherent, and clearly supported by the data you reported in the Results section.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The references are comprehensive, relevant, well-aligned with the topic, and appropriate for supporting a study on inpatient fall events.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This manuscript is strong and addresses a meaningful clinical issue. With clarifications regarding methodology, definition of risk factors, and injury reporting, the study's scientific value and applicability would be significantly enhanced. The paper has good potential for publication after revision.

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.
While clear, the title could be more specific to reflect the study design and population.
It does not indicate that the study is retrospective or based on geriatric rehabilitation patients.
"Evaluation of fall events" is somewhat vague; specifying descriptive analysis or risk factors and prevention measures would better signal the content.
"Inpatient care facility" is broad; the study is actually in a post-acute rehabilitation center (geriatric ward).
The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.
Methods lack detail: The abstract does not specify that the study is retrospective, nor does it mention the setting (geriatric ward in a rehabilitation center). It also omits the data source (fall protocols) and analysis type (descriptive statistics only).
Results could be more structured. Injury outcomes (abrasions, bruises, fractures) are mentioned briefly but without percentages or context. Risk factors are listed but not quantified.
No mention of ethics or limitations: Journals often expect at least a brief note on ethical compliance or study limitations in the abstract.
Terminology: "Evaluation of fall events" is vague; consider specifying "retrospective descriptive analysis."
There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
Examples of Errors
Spelling mistakes:
"Demograpfics data" should be Demographic data.
"Schoes and clothing" should be Shoes and clothing.
"Climbing stairs, sitting down on a chair, and getting out of bed are situational constraints" is awkward phrasing; could be simplified for clarity.

Grammar and phrasing:
"Falls pose a significant risk to older people in nursing facilities. They can lead to serious health consequences, prolonged stays, and impaired quality of life." Correct but could be more formal: "Falls pose significant risks for older adults in nursing facilities, often resulting in serious health consequences, prolonged hospitalization, and reduced quality of life."
"Due to the research questions and objectives, the following relevant variables were collected…" This is slightly awkward; could be: "Based on the research objectives, the following variables were extracted…"
"The evaluation of fall event protocols included the period from January 2021 to December 2023." Better: "Fall event protocols were evaluated for the period January 2021 to December 2023."

Inconsistent tense and style:
Some sentences switch between past and present tense unnecessarily (e.g., "The aim of this study was…" followed by "This study gives rise to the following research questions…").
Use consistent past tense for retrospective studies.

Formatting issues:
Table headings are confusing and need clearer alignment.
References have inconsistent punctuation and spacing (e.g., "Heilbe rufeSCIENCE" should be "HeilberufeSCIENCE").

The errors are minor but noticeable and affect professionalism. They do not obscure meaning but should be corrected before publication.
The study METHODS are explained clearly.
Unit of analysis ambiguity

The text alternates between "patients" and "falls." It says "290 documented falls" but later refers to "patients who experienced a fall." This needs clarification: Was the analysis based on fall events (n=290) or unique patients?
If some patients had multiple falls, how was this handled?

Denominator confusion: It states "55,614 geriatric patients and 79,684 orthopedic patients were studied," but the study focuses on a 45-bed geriatric ward. These numbers seem hospital-wide and unrealistic for patients (likely patient-days). Needs explanation.

Sampling and inclusion criteria
It says "those who experienced at least one fall during their stay were included," but does not specify: Were all falls included or only first falls per patient? Were any exclusions applied (e.g., incomplete protocols)?

Ethics statement
The text says "ethics approval is not required," but journals expect a formal statement of exemption or approval reference.

Statistical detail
Only descriptive statistics are mentioned. No mention of handling missing data (e.g., 13.8% of falls had no time recorded), nor any software version or confidence intervals.

The basic design and variables are described, but critical details (unit of analysis, denominator, inclusion/exclusion, ethics, missing data handling) are missing or ambiguous.
The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
The body of the paper is mostly clear, but it does contain errors—both grammatical and technical. These should be corrected before submission to ensure professionalism and compliance with journal standards.
The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.
The conclusion accurately reflects the findings and does not introduce unsupported claims.

Areas for improvement
Too general: It repeats findings without quantifying them (e.g., "most falls occur in patient rooms" could include the percentage).
No limitations mentioned. Our journal expect acknowledgment of study limitations (single center, retrospective design, missing time data, non-standard denominator).

Causal language: Phrases like "led to a fall" should be softened to "associated with falls" because the study is descriptive as oposed to experimental.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Appropriate and relevant, but needs formatting corrections and minor updates for completeness and consistency with journal style.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):