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Dear Rikki

Re: Response to reviewer’s comments

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to respond to the reviewers’ comments and revise our manuscript.

I have detailed the responses below on behalf of the authors.

Reviewer 2

1. Thankyou for drawing attention to this article which has been reviewed and referred to in the paper (P 10)

2. Additional information has been provided about the settings from which recruitment occurred. (P5)

3. Thankyou for requesting we review this aspect of the study. As a pragmatic clinical study (P 5/6), patients were assessed with DXA in locations according to their preference for convenience. Both Lunar and Hologic devices were used and as such as acknowledged in the limitations of the study is likely to have led to measurement inaccuracy. Additional explanation has been added in the methods (P5) and further reference to issues pertaining to measurement error has been included in the discussion (P10). The authors have discussed this issue and in conjunction with advice from a colleague (Professor John Wark) have decided to focus the analysis on T Score comparisons. Appropriate adjustment to the study methods (P 6), and results (P8) have been made.
4. Further discussion has been added as suggested (P9)
5. The authors agree and have amended this discussion point (P10)

Minor Essential Revisions

6. Abbreviations have been reviewed accordingly
7. DXA has been reworded as suggested (P4)
8. The word `study¿ has been used rather than `survey¿ as suggested (P7)
9. The information relating to outcomes measured has been expanded as suggested
10. The 255 screened women represents 62.5% total available patient pool. This has been added to the results (P7)
11. ¿for age¿ has been removed from table 2 as suggested and the table edited.
12. Differences in the ROC curves were tested. This information has been added to the methods (P7) and results section (P8)
13. The paper has been carefully edited as suggested

Reviewer 1

Thankyou for drawing our attention to the article by Rud which we have reviewed and included in our discussion (P7)

1. An abstract was written and somehow did not upload. This has been redressed.
2. Please see response to reviewer 2, item no 2
3. Please see response to reviewer 2, item 3 The definition of diagnosis of osteoporosis has been corrected (P 4). The use of T score < -1 and less than or equal to -2.5 as an outcome measure for both femoral neck and lumbar spine has been retained as this was used to assess predictive attributes of the CDT for either site and the authors consider it useful to include prediction for BMD at both sites in accordance with suggestions in Kanis et al 2005. This has been added to the methods (P6)
4. Please see response to reviewer 2- item 12
5. Table 2 has been reviewed and edited to provide clarity as suggested
6. The discussion paragraphs have been edited and in parts rewritten to better capture these points. Reference to the Nguyen article has been included (P 11)
Yours sincerely

Caroline Brand