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Reviewer's report:

General
Exceptional revision. Ready for publication after addressing a few minor comments. For consistency within the literature, I suggest that the authors consider using a more standard acronym throughout the manuscript. Perhaps they could use DXA specifically or BMD (bone mineral density) testing instead of BDM? Both DXA and BMD are used by Osteoporosis Societies (e.g., OSC, NOF) and by the International Society for Clinical Densitometry (ISCD). There are several (too many to list) very minor suggestions for languages changes. Authors can be trusted to correct them.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
Page 5
Rather than detailing what drugs were available in the US, indicate what was available in Canada and in particular under Quebec pharmacare (thus relevant to study under investigation).

Page 9
Clarify that DXA was the only type of bone densitometry included.

Page 15 (in reference to Solomon et al. paper)
Clarify that investigation means BMD testing
As pointed out on page 5, they found old age AND young age
Last sentence may not be appropriate as it appears that Solomon et al. found similar predictors when examining BMD and OP medication use separately (data not shown in the paper refer to their statistical analysis section). Perhaps authors could contact Dr. Solomons group for details?

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
As suggested above under general comments, consider changing your BDM acronym to BMD (bone mineral density) testing or DXA specifically.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No
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