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**Reviewer’s report:**

Overall, the authors produced a methodologically quite robust paper incorporating all major references on this clinically relevant subject.

Unfortunately, their statistical methods are so complex that many clinicians will be puzzled by whether the conclusions really make sense. A major concern in this regard already appears in the ABSTRACT where the Results section provides guidance for clinicians on the choice of osteoporosis medication followed by the Conclusion that significant differences between drugs in the odds of reducing fractures do not exist.

Equally important, use of indirect comparisons entails strong assumptions including, among others, comparability of event rates among control (placebo) participants. A clinician-oriented paragraph on this issue might be incorporated discussion.

Remaining issues
Page 15: Does an I² value of 64% really indicate moderate heterogeneity?  
Page 15: What is the rationale for removing Cummings and Greenspan?  
Figures 3, 4, and 5: What are the events? Provide title for each Figure.

**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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