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**Reviewer's report:**

**Minor Essential Revisions**

1. Line 332, 411, 423: confidence intervals contain 1 and therefore there is no statistically significant effect. Text should reflect that rather than increased risk.

2. Line 223: Is the reference for the inverse variance method correct

3. Line 316: Is the reference for Monson criteria correct

**Discretionary Revisions**

1. The importance of the research could be emphasized more. For example, the abstract conclusions could state the purpose/significance of the study - which is ultimately to identify individuals who can benefit from fracture prevention programs.

2. Lines 540-543: Instead of saying that the results can be used to determine which variables...
   Can you make it stronger by saying, for example:
   The results from this review suggest that a tool specific to LTC include cognitive impairment....
   – list the specific variables based on your results.
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**Quality of written English:** Acceptable
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