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Reviewer’s report:

Discretionary Revisions:

1. Throughout the paper you refer to “chi square” as “X2” when the X should be italicized (X²).
2. It would be helpful to have a definition of a “low-energy fracture” in the second paragraph of the background section where you first introduce this term. You do define this in your methods section, so the reader eventually gets this info, but including it sooner in the paper would make things much clearer.
3. Throughout the paper when you reference tables and figures you do not capitalize the first letter of the word in parentheses. For example (table 1), instead of (Table 1). This is very minor and you may chose to leave it as is. As per APA however, this first letter would need to be capitalized.
4. Perhaps add a sentence at the end of the depressive symptoms paragraph of the measurements section stating that higher scores on the EDS indicate more depression. While this is implied it may be useful to make this explicit statement.
5. Throughout the paper you refer to a T-test with a capital T when it should be a lower case t (t-test).
6. In the second sentence of the statistical analysis section you say “with falls as the dependent variable”. Perhaps you could be more specific and convergent with logistic regression terminology and say “with presence or absence of falls as the dependent variable”.
7. The results section in general is a bit unclear. Referring to the tables helped clear up some things but you may consider reworking your results section a bit.
8. At the beginning of the first sentence of the third paragraph of the discussion section change “In contrast” to “In addition”.
9. It would be nice to see some correlation tables. This would provide the reader with more information about the relationships between variables, specifically the strength and direction.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. In the results section on the abstract the word baseline has a dash in it (base-line) whereas in the rest of the paper you use “baseline”.
2. In the measurements section in the risk factors for falling paragraph there
should be a comma after the word “consumption”.

3. In the third paragraph of the results section add something to the first sentence indicating that it refers to the entire sample (e.g., “Of the entire sample…32 women (18%) suffered from depression at baseline…”).

4. In the first sentence of the discussion section you need to add the word “older” before post-menopausal women.

5. In the second paragraph of the discussion section you need to add the word “of” between “general population” and “Dutch women”.

General Comment: Overall this was a very sound paper, as you can tell by the very minor and discretionary revisions.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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