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Reviewer's report:

Why was "A calcium intake of 500 mg/d was used as the reference to estimate all RRs"? If there were no data below 500 mg/d, then nothing should appear on the graphs below 500 mg/d. If there were data, then it seems that the lower values, either 250 or 300 mg/d should be used as the reference.

Normally in such analyses, the lowest value is used as the starting point. See, for example, Figure 4 in this paper:


Simply stating 800 and 900 mg/d in the abstract is not, in my opinion, sufficient since it does not give any range or 95% confidence intervals.

I suggest using 500 mg/d be justified in the text and why there are values below 500 mg/d or that 250 and 300 mg/d be used as the starting points.

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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