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Author's response to reviews: see over
Respected Madam

Dear Dr. Annabel Phillips

We have answered and revised the manuscript based on the comments as follow:

Respected Reviewer’s comments:

A) It would be necessary to limit the number of tables that is very too high: We have limited the number of tables with the most important information

B) nutritional variables are probably very correlated between them, and could be grouped into categories such as intake of protein, calcium: As I mentioned in the text we have used Food Frequency Questionnaire to evaluate the life time nutritional status and as you know these kind of questionnaires (that are the most common questionnaires for finding the risk factors) are mostly semi quantitative thus we are not able to calculate the exact intake of calcium and protein. In other hand some kind of foods like red meat and white meat (chicken and fish) both are good sources of protein and calcium but high consumption of red meat was a risk factor in Iran and chicken and fish were protective factors in both countries. (I think that is very interesting to report)

C) What do the author means by "Adjusted for age and other relevance": we have corrected this part in tables: other relevance include weight and height that are the most important relevant factors with osteoporosis. Adjustment for age height and weight is very common in epidemiological studies on osteoporosis. We also adjusted the results for variables like fracture history and other separately and it did not change the main results.

Editorial concerns:

1) Document the type of consent (verbal or written) obtained from the participants.

We have documented this part in methodology paragraph 3, line 8 and also in ethical issues’ section.

2) Remove additional file 3 containing ethical approval documentation.

I have removed this part

Many thanks

Afsaneh Keramat