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Minor Essential Revisions

Albertsson et al

The authors have presented data from a prospective study evaluating a simplified clinical risk score for prediction of hip fragility fracture and compared it with fracture risk predicted by heel BMD.

General Comments

1. This is a well-written manuscript in which the methods are clearly stated and the results clearly presented and appropriately discussed.
2. The authors have used statistical tests appropriately, which will enable comparison with equivalent studies in the literature.
3. The authors need to clearly define “fragility fracture” at the outset. It appears that the authors mean that these fractures are everything other than hip fractures.

Specific Comments

Abstract


Introduction

2. Page 5, Line 6. “have” should be “has”.
3. Page 5, Line 7. “BMD device” should be “BMD measuring device”.
4. Page 5, Line 15. “women” should be “female”.

Methods

2. Page 6, Line 1. “were since two years part” should be “for two years were part”.
7. Page 8, Line 5. “(62/285) women” should be “(62/285) of women”.
8. Page 8, Line 13. “13% bisphosphonate” should be “13% taking a bisphosphonate”.
9. Page 9, Line 3. “with 5.2%” should be “by 5.2%”.
10. Page 9, Line 16. “Missing replies …. This is a dangerous thing to do as bias could be introduced. You should re-check your statistics with a package, such as SAS that is able to perform this type of analysis on unbalanced datasets ie. Some missing values. Your conclusions are unlikely to change but it is best to check.
11. Page 10, Line 2. “in the SPSS” should be “in SPSS”.

Results

1. Page 10, Line 12. “and each of these four risk factors was found” should be “and all of these four risk factors were found”.
2. Page 11, Line 6. “as single” should be “as a single”.
3. Page 11, Line 7. Please give state a number for the risk.

Discussion

1. Page 12, Line 14. “six-folded” should be “six-fold”.
2. Page 12, Line 14. “high risk” should be “high-risk”.
3. Page 13, Line 15. “in level” should be “equivalent”.
4. Page 14, Line 7. “out of” should be “using”.
5. Page 14, Line 7. “at heels” should be “at the heel”.
6. Page 16, Line 9. “study results” should be “study”.
7. Page 16, Line 11. “predict HF” should be “predicted HF”.
8. Page 16, Line 12. “small risk group” should be “small group”.
9. Page 16, Line 15. “To combine the” should be “Combining the”.

Figure 3

1. R square is quoted when all other coefficients in the manuscript have been R.
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