

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

Manuscript NO: 80685

Title: Diagnosis and treatment of chronic osteomyelitis based on nanomaterials

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05307734

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-09

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-11 06:31

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-17 03:40

Review time: 5 Days and 21 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous



Baishideng Baishideng Publishing

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

Telephone: +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? yes 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? yes 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? yes 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? can be strengthened 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? no 6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? yes 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? can be strenthened 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? need more figures and talbes 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? not applicable 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? yes 11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? ok 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate?



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

Telephone: +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

well organized, but the style, language and grammar need to be improved. 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) -Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist -Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement -Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? not applicable 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? yes The review presented an interesting issue in treatment of chronic osteomyelitis with nanomaterials. However major revisions are needed to make this manuscript proper for publication. I suggest to the authors to add as many graphical images as possible for the section 2 (Nanomaterials for diagnosis and treatment of osteomyelitis, at least 4 figures for this section) to simplify the readers. Also, one or more tables are suggested to be listed in the section 2 to indicate what optimum conditions support the diagnosis and treatment of chronic osteomyelitis with nanomaterials. The use of professional terms seems to be casual. It is recommended to clearly define and keep consistency as much as possible. Such as "chronic osteomyelitis", "Pyogenic osteomyelitis" and "suppurative osteomyelitis"..... Though the authors provided a Non-Native Speakers of English Editing Certificate with the manuscript, a complete grammar check/proof reading are still needed to ensure that there are no grammatical errors or redundancies and improve the Chinglish expressions in many parts of the text. An example for sentences with expression problems, Recent animal experiments and



clinical applications show that nanoparticles show great potential compared to existing drugs because of the size of nanoparticles that can quickly enter pathogenic microorganisms or bone cells.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

Manuscript NO: 80685

Title: Diagnosis and treatment of chronic osteomyelitis based on nanomaterials

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03982286 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-09

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-08 02:48

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-17 04:07

Review time: 9 Days and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous



https://www.wignet.com

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors review the nanomaterials for osteomyelitis. The review is so interesting, however, I have some concerns to be discussed. -What review is this, narrative or systematic, or others? -What is the novelty of the current study? -Can nanomaterials lead to early detection? -Is it effective against any initiating bacteria? For example, is it effective against osteomyelitis caused by Salmonella? Please refer to the following literature for further discussion. Salmonella Osteomyelitis of the Distal Tibia in a Healthy Woman. Acta Med Okayama. 2018 Dec;72(6):601-604. doi: 10.18926/AMO/56379. PMID: 30573916. Salmonella Osteomyelitis of the Rib Mimicking a Mammary Tumor: A Case Report. Tohoku J Exp Med. 2020 Aug;251(4):273-277. doi: 10.1620/tjem.251.273. PMID: 32727973.



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

Manuscript NO: 80685

Title: Diagnosis and treatment of chronic osteomyelitis based on nanomaterials

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05307734 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-09

Reviewer chosen by: Jing-Jie Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-02 16:10

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-02 16:22

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

a careful check on language and revision on professional comments is needed.