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Reviewer's report:

In general, this is an interesting study about the utilisation of diagnosis and treatment in individuals at increased risk of osteoporotic fractures. The authors conclude that the presence of established risk factors result in only a small number of diagnostic interventions in women. Underdiagnosis of women with risk factors may lead to serious consequences for the women and for the society. This fact is all the more interesting because risk factors are well evaluated and described in guidelines. Accordingly, the number of treated individuals is low (women) and negligible (men) indicating that therapeutic options, though available and covered, are not always used. The methods described for this analysis appear to be appropriate. Results and conclusions are well-balanced and important limitations are mentioned. However, I would recommend to shorten the manuscript in the sections results and discussion considerably.

Minor concerns:
Designation (throughout): the term prevalence of BDM or OM seems unusual. Please rename (e.g., proportion, number)

Page 7, paragraph 1: in this section, the authors described the risk factors used for the analysis. The choice of risk factors should be justified as available tools for defining fracture risk differ somewhat (see NICE, the FRAX-tool or the risk assessment tool of the German DVO)

Page 6, subheading "Health factors and medication": participants of this analysis should estimate their health status using the categories 'poor', 'medium' and 'good'. Why quality of life was assessed with these categories instead of measuring health-related quality of life with an established instrument? In addition, self-estimation of a person's lifestyle by describing it as health-orientated or not is hardly useful.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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