



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 87596

Title: The efficacy and safety of different anti-osteoporotic drugs for the spinal fusion surgery: A network meta-analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03596983

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: Doctor, PhD

Professional title: Professor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-08-17

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-08-17 23:11

Reviewer performed review: 2023-08-19 15:18

Review time: 1 Day and 16 Hours

Scientific quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I would like to thank the editor and the journal office for giving us the opportunity to review an interesting manuscript. After spending a considerable amount of time reviewing the requested manuscript (The efficacy and safety of different anti-osteoporotic drugs for the spinal fusion surgery: A network meta-analysis), I have reached the following opinion. This manuscript on an important topic meets the needs of the readers of this journal and is scientifically novel. However, there are some issues that need to be addressed. In particular, I think there are a number of issues that need to be addressed before I can agree to publish the manuscript. Network meta-analysis is also a systematic review methodology. The reason why SR is different from narrative review is the reproducibility of the data collection process rather than the statistical analysis. And the most important factor for readers to judge this is whether the search strategy is transparent. Therefore, you must submit the search term used in all DBs used for the literature search in this study as a supplementary file. The searcher used for each DB must be reported as it is, and in the case of a Chinese DB such as CNKI, the Chinese search term must be submitted as it is. Like the randomised controlled trial, the

systematic review is an important source of evidence for clinical decision making. Therefore, it is important to register research protocols in advance in public databases such as PROSPERO or OSF to avoid bias in the process of deriving results. However, there is no mention of this in this manuscript. Therefore, at the beginning of the Methods section, please present the previously officially registered protocol and the access path to search for it. As this is essential for a systematic review, it is not acceptable to conduct a protocol without a pre-registered PROTOCOL or to register a PROTOCOL retrospectively. 3. In principle, systematic reviews after 2020 should use RoB2, a revised risk assessment tool. Compared to the existing RoB 1.0, this tool allows for a more robust and rigorous risk of bias assessment. Therefore, please reassess the risk of bias in this manuscript using this tool. The following references provide guidance for this work. Suggested reference doi: 10.1136/bmj.l4898. It is unclear what the primary outcome representing the conclusions of this manuscript is and why it was chosen. Is osteoporotic change an outcome directly related to ODI? To avoid confusion for the reader, please state the primary outcome and the secondary outcome in separate paragraphs and explain why you have chosen them as evaluation index. I hope that my views will help improve the manuscript and successfully publish it.