



ISSN NO. 2320-5407

ISSN(O): 2320-5407 | ISSN(P): 3107-4928

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-56318

Title: Can artificial intelligence replace the role of the radiologist in the reporting of wrist radiographs?

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*).....

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		Yes		
Techn. Quality		Yes		
Clarity		Yes		
Significance		Yes		

Detailed Reviewer's Report

This study investigates whether freely available artificial intelligence tools can match the diagnostic performance of radiologists in reporting wrist radiographs by analysing 100 anonymised images against an orthopaedic expert-verified gold standard. The research is relevant and timely, with a clear objective and a well-structured retrospective design, and it uses appropriate diagnostic performance indicators such as sensitivity, specificity, accuracy, predictive values, and Youden's index to enable meaningful evaluation. The inclusion of both normal and abnormal radiographs representing varied clinical conditions strengthens the dataset, and the use of a standardised prompt improves methodological consistency; however, the sample size is relatively small, the study is limited to two general AI platforms rather than radiology-specific trained models, and there is insufficient discussion on image quality control, inter-observer validation, prompt reproducibility, and statistical significance testing. The findings are presented clearly and appropriately show that both systems performed close to chance level, highlighting high false-positive rates for Grok and low sensitivity for CT-read, which supports the conclusion that such tools are not yet reliable for independent clinical use. The discussion would benefit from deeper comparison with existing literature on AI in musculoskeletal imaging and clearer implications for clinical workflow, medico-legal responsibility, and future model training. Overall, the manuscript is informative and methodologically sound for a pilot evaluation, but it requires minor to moderate revisions in terms of statistical depth, expanded discussion, and clearer reporting of limitations before being considered for publication.