



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 12033

Title: Osteoporosis and fracture risk: New perspectives for early diagnosis and treatment assessment, ID 02706918

Reviewer code: 02508171

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-06-19 09:16

Date reviewed: 2014-07-13 03:39

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article reviews the advances of MRI imaging for trabecular bone architecture assessment and fracture prediction. It is interesting and worth reading. The author should consider the following comments: - The title is too broad. It should contain MRI and clinical assessment of bone structure or MRI imaging of bone or MRI assessment of trabecular bone architecture, to draw attention of some specialized readers. - Abstract is too long, it should be focused on the precise new data/idea on MRI - Conclusion is too long, it should not repeat the information from the article - Abstract, second sentence. What do you mean by bone demineralization? Do you have intention to screen for osteomalacia? Consider revising. - Abstract, third sentence, you wrote "bone mineral content (BMD)", it is not the same bone mineral content should be BMC, BMD is bone mineral density. - Introduction, the second paragraph. "a faster kinetic of bone demineralization characterizes..." sounds unusual and wrong, if the author has intention to discuss postmenopausal osteoporosis - Page 5. Magnetic Resonance Imaging. "MRI-based diagnosis could be used to substitute standard BMD measurement..." seems too strong. The limitation of cost and poor validation of MRI for fracture prediction should be mentioned and discussed. - English editing might be beneficial



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 12033

Title: Osteoporosis and fracture risk: New perspectives for early diagnosis and treatment assessment, ID 02706918

Reviewer code: 02467561

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-06-19 09:16

Date reviewed: 2014-07-03 22:41

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> [] High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [] No records	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> [] Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors, The paper "Osteoporosis and fracture risk: New perspectives for early diagnosis and treatment assessment" looks convincing both in terms of description of the different methods of analysis and rich bibliography tracing 40 years of studies and analyses. Although the study aimed at showing the innovativeness and validation of the TBA method is currently underway, in my opinion the paper can be accepted for publication.



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 12033

Title: Osteoporosis and fracture risk: New perspectives for early diagnosis and treatment assessment, ID 02706918

Reviewer code: 02444711

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-06-19 09:16

Date reviewed: 2014-06-23 10:49

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a technical article to introduce a new concept of an analysis technique of magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) for the characterization of trabecular bone architecture (TBA), which combines medical imaging technique, texture analysis procedure and mathematical approach. This is a rather new area in the field. The key advantage of MRI is radiation-free and therefore is worthy to further explore as an alternative to the current technology of CT or pQCT. I have the following comments for the article: 1. The title cannot reflect well the content of the article. The current topic looks as if it reviews the current available technologies for diagnosis of osteoporosis and fracture risks. However, this is just to review mainly the new analysis technique of MRI. The topic is somehow misleading. Please provide a title that can reflect the content well. 2. The whole manuscript is telling all the evidences or facts mainly qualitatively. Very few quantitative data can be found and not much discussion on the data too. No comparison of the proposed new technique with the current gold standard (e.g. high-resolution pQCT) is reviewed, which is most crucial for a new technique. This looks like a pure technical paper by reviewing the technical facts without solid evidence support on the validity or feasibility of the new technique. 3. Discussion part is just to repeat the points mentioned in the upper part of the manuscript. No new points are added, while the conclusion is to repeat all the points once more. These look clumsy and redundant.