



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_48850
Title of the Manuscript:	Diagnostic value of distal forearm densitometry for osteoporosis; alone or add to hip and spine densitometry?
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Authors need to add the following in conclusion section</p> <p>Bone mineral density alone is not a reliable parameter to detect patients at high risk of fracture. The diversity of the clinical phenotypes of discolored teeth, blueness of the sclera, back and joint pain, heart disease, hearing problems and a long list of orthopedic problems are to be considered. BMD results and the other risk factors of the FRAX algorithm are just co-factors and in genuine practice are not diagnostic. Under the false and common conception among the vast majority of physicians, that intrinsic bone disorders are rare entities. This resulted in underestimating the real occurrence and the significance of diagnosing intrinsic bone disorders and the related disorders. The wide spectrum of confusing clinical and radiographic phenotypes made the task even harder.</p> <p>Reference</p> <p><i>Al Kaissi A, Windpassinger C, Chehida FB, Ghachem MB, Nassib NM, Kenis V, Melchenko E, Morenko E, Ryabykh S, Hofstaetter JG, Grill F, Ganger R, Kircher SG. How frequent is osteogenesis imperfecta in patients with idiopathic osteoporosis?: Case reports. Medicine (Baltimore). 2017 Sep;96(35)</i></p>	We added this section according to reviewer opinion.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	