

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Orthopaedic Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORR_125154
Title of the Manuscript:	Expert perspectives on the clinical experience of managing osteoporosis and osteoarthritis in Indian settings
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript addresses two prevalent and impactful musculoskeletal conditions, osteoporosis (OP) and osteoarthritis (OA), which collectively pose a growing global health challenge. The detailed exploration of current prevalence, risk factors, and clinical management strategies, particularly in the Indian context, provides valuable insights for healthcare practitioners. By surveying expert clinicians, the study highlights critical gaps in screening and treatment approaches, emphasizing the need for standardized and patient-centric strategies. These findings not only inform clinical practice but also guide future research and policy-making efforts aimed at optimizing the management of OP and OA.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The title of the article is suitable.</p>	
<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>	<p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive, but I would suggest some improvements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The abstract mentions a "multi-response questionnaire," but it should specify the study's name as the CORE-2 study, as referenced in the manuscript.</li> <li>- In the statement "63% of the experts linked excess body weight to an increased likelihood of OA," the actual percentage might not be clearly aligned with the manuscript results, where different percentages are provided for factors associated with OA, please clarify this.</li> <li>- The conclusion overly generalizes the findings by stating, "excessive alcohol consumption, family history, and obesity in both OA and OP." This statement is too broad and does not reflect the nuanced differences in risk factors between OP and OA as highlighted in the manuscript.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript presents data and expert opinions on the management and prevalence of osteoporosis (OP) and osteoarthritis (OA) in India, with generally accurate representation of the epidemiology and pharmacological management strategies. However, there are some areas where scientific correctness could be improved. For example, the manuscript mentions paracetamol as a non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID), which is incorrect; paracetamol is classified as an analgesic and antipyretic, not an NSAID. Additionally, while discussing treatment efficacy, the manuscript could benefit from citing specific clinical trials or meta-analyses to strengthen the validity of the statements made regarding calcitriol, paracetamol, and tramadol. Clarifying these points would enhance the scientific accuracy and reliability of the conclusions.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The English quality of the article is suitable.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ecaterina Rinja</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>"Carol Davila" University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Bucharest Clinical Emergency Hospital, Romania</b>