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**Reviewer's report:**

This is a basic descriptive study comparing prescription of Teriparatide in a Greek cohort of osteoporosis patients to a previous Greek cohort and a multinational cohort. The paper is generally well written and the topic is relevant because changes in prescription practice across cultures and over time is of major public health importance. I am not an osteoporosis expert.

Major compulsory revisions:

I really have only three major issues that I suspect the authors can deal with fairly easily.

1) In the methods section please describe in detail how the data were collected by describing each variable, the questions/instruments used and the response options.

2) In the discussion, please start with a summary of findings (in fact where page 11 starts) and focus the discussion on the research question and the data collected namely the comparison of the cohorts in the context of the financial crisis. This means that the section “New indications, new patients” can and should be considerably shortened.

3) You collect quite a bit of information on back pain, which you report in some detail. Back pain is a very common symptom in the elderly also in the absence of osteoporosis. Please discuss your findings in the context of this and discuss current knowledge about the contribution of osteoporosis to the burden of back pain in the elderly.

Minor revisions:

1) You write that you data management and analysis was “centralized”, please explain.

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

**Declaration of competing interests:**
I declare that I have no competing interests