ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Diabetes
ESPS Manuscript NO: 2657
Title: Diabetes-related impairment in bone strength is established early in the life course
Reviewer code: 00980642
Science editor: Song, Xiu-Xia
Date sent for review: 2013-03-07 08:51
Date reviewed: 2013-03-14 18:16

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[ ] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B (Very good)	[Y] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C (Good)	[ ] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	[ ] No records	
[Y] Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	[ ]Rejection
[ ] Grade E (Poor)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	[ ] Existed	[ ] Minor revision
		[ ] No records	[Y] Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper compares bone properties in NOD and NOD.scid mice (that do not develop diabetes). The conclusions are interesting but the paper is difficult to follow. This is largely because the authors have not included figure legends that allow the reader to follow exactly what is shown in the figures. In figure 1 it should be stated if bars represent mean+/- SD (or is it SEM?). In figure 2 the legend states that the figures represent "Body composition differences". At week 5 all values are 0. It is not clear why - since the text states that body weight at week 5 between NOD and NOD.scid mice is significantly different. The data has clearly been standardised in someway. All of this should be clarified in a figure legend. Figure 3 has no units on either axis and no indication if the bars represent mean and SD (or n numbers). Does the figure represent maximum load? It would be helpful if the authors made the difference between table 1 and table 2 clearer. I believe that table 1 represents the pooled data from five and eight week old mice. However, it is not clear in this case why the body weight value for NOD mice in this table is greater than the body weight for 8 week old NOD mice in table 2 (bearing in mind that the value in table 1 should be averaged across both 8 week old mice and 5 week old mice which table 2 shows are noticably lighter).   The text states that the NOD mice at week 5 have significantly less body weight than the NOD.scid (first paragraph of results) however this comparison is not marked as being significant in table 2. It would be interesting for the authors to comment on why they think that the increased Ct.MTV and ct.TMD in NOD mice at week 8 does not translate into increased   mechanical strength. Have the authors looked at intrinsic bone properties in the two strains?

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[ ] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B (Very good)	[Y] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C (Good)	[ ] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	[ ] No records	
[Y] Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade E (Poor)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	[ ] Existed	[ ] Minor revision
		[ ] No records	[Y] Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors provide a study on association between bone strength and type 1 diabetes.   This article is interesting, dealing with not fully resolved problem of bone strength in T1D. The manuscript is clearly laid out. Abstract, introduction, methodology, results, discussion and conclusion are appropriate.   Weaknesses: Discussion seems very thin. The authors are not reasoning their results enough in the discussion.