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Reviewer's report:

This article aimed to estimated the cost of non-persistence with oral bisphosphonates (BP) in post-menopausal treatment in France. The article used a validated Markov model to estimate the cost of non-persitance in the French context.

The article is well-written, very well described (sometimes too much described..). The model is relevant, adapted to the study question. I have some discretionary revisions, which are described here:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? yes this is clear
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   The methods are well described and the hypothesis are justified and appropriate. This is correct. Page 15, the paragraph with begins by "Cost criterion " in the analyses section is written two times.
3. Are the data sound? yes, this is correct
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? yes
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   The discussion section is too general in my opinion. There is insufficient discussion about the limitations of the model. For example, the authors could discuss the fact that direct medical cost of fractures were restricted to hospitalization (are all the fractures treated at hospital? Are some fractures managed in ambulatory sector?). In my opinion, cost are underestimated, as indirect cost, transport cost, and cost in ambulatory sector are not taken into account. This should be discussed.
   Moreover, the authors should discuss the 10-years time horizon. Are the results changed if a lifetime horizon is considered?
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? see last response
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? yes
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? yes
9. Is the writing acceptable? yes

**Level of interest:** An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests