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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes, the authors asked a very clear, focused questions of whether urinary acidity (PH or net acid excretion) is correlated to BMD. The provide the relevant literature review as background.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Yes, rigorous statistical methods have been applied with appropriate adjustment for confounders. Sample size is adequate to test their hypothesis.

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes, they used appropriate inclusion criteria,

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes, the authors understand the complexity of this topic and the collective evidence

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Yes, but I would further emphasize the weakness of first morning void as compared to longer term urinary collections (e.g 24 or 48 h total collection). They are careful to point out the potential issues with storage of the urine samples.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   I do not see evidence of building on unpublished work, but otherwise, yes.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   Yes.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
   Very clear; good flow.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Acceptable

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