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Reviewer’s report:

major revisions
please explain Table 1. why were the 849 patients not eligible. Over half had a fracture. The patient flow and selection are confusing.
In the questionnaire population, please divide into patients eligible based on BMD vs fracture. Were there any differences.
It would have been of interest to study patients with OP by BMD or fracture who did not receive medications and understand if this was associated with treating MD type.
When was this study conducted? why was FRAX not used as a variable?How were patients recruited in practices? were they consecutive?
The conclusion as stated is circular. Since patients were dx as OP by BMD they had a BMD. Do the authors mean that most patients with fx had a BMD?
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