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Reviewer’s report:

The methods used in this study were well described and appropriate although unfortunately the hypothesized was found not to be superior with the conventional method of using aBMD to predict fractures.

The author gave an interesting discussion on the roles of bone size, cortical shell thickness as well as physical activity in predicting fractures. That makes the reader wonder how many elderly men in this sample actually had a fall without fracture. It would be interesting to capture the data of incidents that include injury or fall and test if there is any association with the other study findings.

Page 4 line 21 the language of the sentence needs to be revised. Original text says 'The primary aim of this study was to in elderly men investigate if a musculoskeletal composite score...'

In summary, the paper is clear and readable. The findings are good to know though does not have an impact on current practice.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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