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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting study comparing VFA and X-ray for the detection of prevalent fractures regarding clinical and cost-effectiveness as well as radiation dose.

The following are some questions/suggestions:

- From the title and abstract it is not clear that actually only a prediction model was calculated based on data from the literature and no "real" patient data were evaluated

- Maybe also refer to the fact that having analyzed Korean data in abstract and title?

- Last paragraph line 37-41 In addition,… - this sentence needs to be rephrased.

- Authors should explain briefly in the introduction why not only VFA and X-Ray were compared, but also X-Ray following VFA (false negative i.e. upper thoracic vertebra)

- The sensitivity and specificity of new DXA devices (i.e., iDXA) might be much higher - This would change the results regarding VFs reduction and has to be discussed

- In daily clinical routine it is very convenient to perform VFA at the same time as BMD measurements; once a fracture is detected, normally no additional X-ray has to be performed (on iDXA)

- Why did "VFA only" have the highest costs? Just because of unnecessary treatment? Otherwise I would expect this to have lower costs than X-Ray following VFA
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