

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Diabetes

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 31591

**Title:** Osteomyelitis in diabetic foot: A comprehensive overview

**Reviewer's code:** 03679821

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-11-29 09:18

**Date reviewed:** 2016-12-02 11:26

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript is a literature review article regarding the treatment of osteomyelitis in the diabetic foot. The manuscript is quite comprehensive and does a good job of covering all aspects of diabetic foot osteomyelitis, including diagnosis, medical and surgical treatment. There are some grammatical issues that will need to be addressed. This is acceptable to publish as a review.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Diabetes

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 31591

**Title:** Osteomyelitis in diabetic foot: A comprehensive overview

**Reviewer's code:** 03509648

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-11-29 09:18

**Date reviewed:** 2016-12-12 06:42

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

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

- on page 3, while the sensitivity and specificity is cited for the ulcer area, for the depth there is a percentage association - would be better to provide either sensitivity and specificity for this predictor also, or a p-value/confidence interval - on page 4, the first para explaining the relevance of the sensitivity and specificity previously mentioned is unnecessary and only adds wordiness; the interpretation of the relatively lower sensitivity and higher specificities of these tests is easy to understand and does not need belaboring - on page 7, the single sentence talking about 'the treatment of osteomyelitis is a topic of great interest..' may be deleted as it interrupts the flow - the last line of the paper, just prior to 'critical issues' needs to be corrected, I am not sure what is being conveyed by it

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Diabetes

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 31591

**Title:** Osteomyelitis in diabetic foot: A comprehensive overview

**Reviewer's code:** 03069301

**Reviewer's country:** Spain

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-11-29 09:18

**Date reviewed:** 2016-12-05 07:06

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors present an interesting review of the diabetic foot. Syntax must be improved (for example in page 1 they write: "Gram positive bacteria as staphylococcus aureus are the bacteria usually involved in foot infections". "Bacteria" is repeated twice in the same sentence: should be change by "microorganism" or any other word. Also along the text "microorganism" should be changed by "microorganism". Also the paper is written in clumsy English: In page 1, the last sentence: "It may reflect the increased prevalence of these bacteria both in hospitals and not" is a bad English. The first sentence (page 1) of the paper is: "Infection is the main cause of major lower limb amputation for foot ulcers in diabetic patients in more than two-thirds of cases". The third sentence of page 2 says the same: "Osteomyelitis of the foot is due to non-healing ulcers and is associated with increased risk of major amputation". Also in page 2: "The possible involvement of the bone should be suspected in all patients with diabetic neuropathic ulcers clinically infected or chronic wounds, with a long time of healing or that healed once they tend to recur, despite the implementation of appropriate treatment that includes offloading" is again a clumsy English. Many other sentences along the paper should be improved. The "probe-to-bone test" (PTB) should be explained in a better



## 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](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

way. PCR should be explained in full the first time it is written. The same comes true for the former "ESR". They probably come from a Spanish or Italian speaking country as wrote "Bibliografia" instead of "References". That must be changed.