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Dear Natalie Pafitis,

Many thanks to look our manuscript Measuring health-related quality of life in men with osteoporosis or osteoporotic fracture and your review.

I consider that your comments have been helpful in order to improve the manage of this paper. I really appreciate the report and the language suggestions. I have done the changes inside de doc and uploaded it in BioMed Central website.

In response to the comments done:

- The addresses have been adapted in order to avoid the mistranslation.
- I have added citations in the statements required.
- The references have been checked and changed if mistake.
- Sample size: The standard deviation of the variable is an important factor. I have done the calculation with 0.35 because it is the greater I have found in the articles I have read. After choosing this standard deviation I have considered the worst situation and therefore the power 95%, the 0.15 difference and 5% significance have been chosen.
- We realize that the fact that a history of fragility fracture reported by the patient may lead to bias, but we believe that because this factor is picked up by the doctor who attends assiduously to the participant, this bias is minimized, because he can contrast information during the questionnarie and through reports or radiographs (X-Ray). Do not forget either that a significant percentage of vertebral fractures are asymptomatic, and that we will not do an active search but presumably they also affect the quality of life of people participating in the study and discussion we also consider this as a limitation of the study. Anyway self-related fractures are an acceptable way to pick up this information.
- P 8, p 7, l 4 to 6. Consider adding an agreement analysis of the two people who use the FRAX software before having a third person break the difference. This analysis could also be done with results from 3 people as well. It would add to the reliability of using the software, unless the people being used in your study already have published their agreement:

  It is right and would be one way to do it. However, our experience with over 2300 surveys and with more than 5000 FRAX calculated is that there are frequent mistakes in the records between 2 and 5% and then always need further review. If they do 2 people need a third and if three people do need a fourth person.

- P 9, p 3, l 4. Over what time frame is [incidence] to be calculated?

  The incidence of fracture is annual during 10-year period (retrospective). Each fracture is accompanied by the date of fracture which fits for years.

Looking forward to hearing from you and do not hesitate to contact me if you need any further details regarding any of these points.

Kind Regards,
Dr Marta Zwart

Ps: Please, let me know that you have received this mail properly.