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Reviewer's report:

I think this is massively improved in terms of the language and clarity, nice work in getting that up to speed.

A couple of further corrections and suggestions;

On Page 4, under inclusion criteria: number 2) I would suggest instead "Children were under 18 years old and could participate in outdoor activities"

Page 10, last paragraph starts with "The dual energy...." Remove "The", also in the next sentence, this does not need a "the" in front of DEXA

In the conclusion, in the very last part of the paragraph (and also in the conclusion section of the abstract), the use of bone damage may not really be accurate. As you have looked specifically at the parameters that are affected by long term use, and they are vitamin D and BMD, it might be more accurate to use osteopenia or osteoporosis?

I think there needs to be a statistics review, as this is not my area of expertise, but the methods appear clear and data also clear

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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