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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Bio Med Editorial Team
Dear Prof Yoshimura

At first we would like to accept our apologies in advanced for replying late because of long New Year holiday in Iran. We revised our article as the mentioned part below according your request.

Major compulsory revision:

Methods:
1. There are 450 blocks in Tehran.
2. 50 blocks in Tehran were chosen randomly. As your request the following text was added to Methods part, page 4, first paragraph, line 2:
The individuals selected based on randomized clustered sampling from 50 blocks in Tehran. For selection of clusters, whole Tehrani's population on base of distribution of them, divided to many clusters. From all clusters 50 of them were randomly selected and after that, in each block, home's numbers whose numbers were twin were selected on based of exclusion and inclusion criteria, in each home 1 person were selected, until the individuals in each group reach to 24 persons.
3. Your recommendation in this matter is definitely correct, as your request we changed our title to: Normative data of bone Mineral Density in healthy population of Tehran, Iran. And we also added in conclusion that, our data assumed as an estimation of reference data in Iran. And also we deleted this statement “but as Tehran is the biggest city in Iran and 1/6 of all population of Iran live in Tehran, therefore the data of this study generalized to Iran” from the end of the article.

Result:
1. as your accurate advice which our study is a cross sectional study not a cohort study we rectify our article and compare the changes of bone density tend with age decade, In spite of reporting the trend of changes of bone density with age. We remove the previous paragraph and replaced the following paragraph in our article in result part, page 6, second paragraph:

Comparing of BMD between different age decades show that; spinal BMD in age group of 40-49, 50-59 and 60-69 in women, 3%, 1% and 4% was less than previous age decade respectively. In the same age groups spinal BMD in men 1%, 6% and 0.2% was less than previous age decade. Also, femur BMD in age group of 40-49, 50-59 and
60-69 in women, 5%, 5% and 9%, was less than previous age decade, and in men 3%, 4% and 3% was less than previous age decade respectively. (Figure 1, 2).

In addition we rectify the following section in discussion part related to above explanation: discussion part, page 7, line 19 and page 8, line 6.

2. Spelling and format of this article was reviewed and the typographical errors were resolved. Meanwhile You asked why we put conclusion after discussion. As the instruction for author describe (http://www.biomedcentral.com/bmcendocrdisord/ifora) we wrote our article biased on of the BMC Endocrine Disorder articles format.

3. As your kind and precise notification we changed figure 1 and 2, and rectify tables.

Minor essential revision:

1. As you mentioned correctly we deleted prospective from the “prospective cross sectional” in our manuscript in the first line of methods part.

Regards,
B.Larijani, MD