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Dear Editor,

Please find attached the second revision of the manuscript "Fracture prevention with vitamin D: considering the inconsistent results" by Gerbrand J Izaks that I would like to submit to BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders.

I thank the reviewers for their comments and I hope that this revision meets all the points of criticism. A detailed response is listed below.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit the revised paper to your journal.

Kind regards,

Gerbrand Izaks.
Response to the reviewers' comments

Reviewer 1: Dr Torgerson

Reviewer 2: Dr Hart
1. Title: the title was changed: “explaining” was replaced by “considering”.
2. Cochrane review: I feel that appropriate reference is made to the Cochrane review.

Reviewer 3: Dr Jones
1. First sentence para 2 discussion: the text was changed.
2. Correlation: here, my opinion respectfully differs from Dr Jones’ as I am not sure whether a correlation coefficient of -0.54 (or -0.56) really is clinically significant. I think that the slope of the regression line is more important than the correlation coefficient as it offers a better description of the relation between achieved vitamin D level (or adherence rate) and fracture risk ratio. Although one might argue that the negative slopes in figures 4 and 5 suggest a clinically significant relation, I think they are of limited value. As stated in the discussion, it seems to me that the negative slopes of the regression lines are mainly due to the small Dawson and Pfeifer trials. To be more clear, “r” was replaced by “slope” in figures 4 and 5 of this second revision.

Reviewer 4: Dr Adachi
1. Fixed vs. random effects model: a fixed effects model was used. This was added to the text of the revised manuscript (Methods).
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