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RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

REVIEWER 1
We would like to thank the reviewer for the thorough review to which our paper was subjected. Our response to the issues raised:

We changed the description of our aim in the abstracted, as quoted by the reviewer.

REVIEWER 2
We would like to thank the reviewer for the thorough review to which our paper was subjected. Our response to the issues raised:

Major Points
1. We changed the description of our aim in the abstracted, as quoted by the reviewer.

2a and 2b. We changed the sentence in our discussion, as suggested by the reviewer: “Current American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO) guidelines and expert panels suggest that patients under ADT with clinically significant bone loss should receive bisphosphonates, regardless of hormonal and metastatic status, and preclinical and clinical data show that bisphosphonates can also prevent and treat CTILB and may inhibit malignant bone disease development in patients with early stage disease.”

3. The studies are listed in table 1.

Minor Points
1. We corrected the figures.

2. We changed the definition.

3. We added this topic in the Methods section: “The meta-analysis was limited to studies that involved with the relationship of prostate cancer and/or hormone therapy with osteoporosis and in any language”

4. No. We only used published articles
5. Yes, the reviewers were blinded.
6. We changed to biomarkers
7. We corrected the paragraph.
8. We added an explanation in the Discussion section.
9. We corrected the sentence.

REVIEWER 3
We would like to thank the reviewer for the thorough review to which our paper was subjected.