

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-55395

Title: Perception, Guideline Utilization and Barriers Against Screening and Management of Osteoporosis among Primary Healthcare Physicians in the Eastern Province of Saudi Arabia 2023-2024

Recommendation:

- ✓ Accept as it is
 Accept after minor revision.....
 Accept after major revision
 Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance	✓			

Reviewer Name: Dr S. K. Nath

Date: 23.12.25

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strengths of the Paper

- **Clear Research Focus:** The study addresses an important gap concerning the perceptions, guideline utilization, and barriers faced by primary healthcare physicians in osteoporosis management in Saudi Arabia, providing valuable context for local practice.
- **Comprehensive Methodology:** The use of a well-structured, self-administered questionnaire encompassing multiple domains including perception, guideline adherence, and barriers demonstrates a thorough approach to data collection.
- **Large Sample Size:** The inclusion of 261 physicians enhances the reliability and generalizability of the findings within the region.
- **Use of Validated Tools:** The questionnaire was developed after literature review and tested via a pilot study with high reliability (Alpha Cronbach 0.9), strengthening the validity of the data.
- **Analysis Techniques:** Appropriate non-parametric statistical tests and correlation analyses were used, given the data distribution, reflecting methodological rigor.
- **Novel Contribution:** This appears to be the first study in Saudi Arabia to stratify barriers into three levels, which adds originality to the research.

Weaknesses of the Paper

- **Limited Explanation of Sampling Method:** The use of convenience sampling could introduce bias and limit external validity; the implications of this choice are not extensively discussed.
- **Cross-Sectional Design Limitation:** The design is inherently unable to establish cause-and-effect relationships, which should be acknowledged more explicitly.
- **Lack of Clarification on Ethical Clearance:** The manuscript does not explicitly mention whether ethical approval was obtained, which is crucial for research involving human participants.
- **Typographical and Formatting Issues:** Minor typographical errors and inconsistent formatting, such as spacing and alignment, are present. The presentation of tables and figures could be improved for clarity.
- **Language and Grammar Quality:** While generally understandable, some sentences are awkwardly constructed or lengthy, affecting readability.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- **Unclear Objective and Results Summarization:** The objectives and findings are dispersed across sections. A clearer, more concise articulation at the beginning and end of the paper would improve coherence.
- **Inadequate Detailing of Limitations:** The limitations section mentions sampling bias and the cross-sectional nature but does not elaborate on strategies to mitigate these issues or their potential impacts.
- **References:** While a substantial number of references are included, some citations lack complete details, and recent relevant studies could be incorporated to strengthen the context.
- **Missing Critical Details:** Details such as the process of questionnaire validation beyond pilot testing, detailed demographic characteristics such as geographic distribution, and specific criteria for perception and barriers levels are not fully elaborated.

Reviewer Comments

- **Ethical Clearance Status:** The manuscript does not specify whether ethical approval was obtained from an institutional review board or ethics committee, which is a necessary component for research involving healthcare professionals and survey data. Clarification on this point is recommended.
- **Issues in the Methodology:** The convenience sampling approach may limit the representativeness of the sample. A randomized sampling method would enhance external validity. Additionally, more information on how the questionnaire was distributed and collected would improve reproducibility.
- **Typographical Mistakes:** There are minor typographical errors, such as inconsistent spacing and some sentence fragments, which should be corrected.
- **Grammar and English Language Quality:** The language overall is acceptable but would benefit from editing for clarity and conciseness. Some sentences are verbose or awkwardly phrased.
- **Formatting Issues:** Tables and figures are sometimes embedded without proper formatting, making them harder to interpret. Consistent formatting across the manuscript would enhance readability.
- **Clarity of Objectives, Results, and Conclusion:** While the objectives, results, and conclusions are generally understandable, they could be better highlight key findings more explicitly at the start of each section for ease of reference.
- **Adequacy of References:** The references are numerous and relevant but could be updated to include the latest literature and guidelines on osteoporosis management to reflect current best practices.
- **Missing or Incomplete Information:** Explicit mention of ethical approval, detailed demographic characteristics, and more comprehensive discussion on the implications of findings are needed. Also, elaborating on how barriers were scored or classified would improve transparency.