



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		-		
Techn. Quality		--		
Clarity		-		
Significance		-		

Detailed Reviewer’s Report

The manuscript addresses an important and timely question regarding whether freely accessible artificial intelligence platforms can replace radiologists in interpreting wrist radiographs. The topic is clinically relevant and well structured overall; however, several methodological and presentation issues require clarification. In the Methods section (lines 56–66), the process of dataset verification needs further detail, particularly how the original diagnostic labels from NIH and Kaggle were validated prior to specialist confirmation. The definition of “diagnosis correct” (lines 73–78) should be operationally clarified—for example, if a fracture is detected but the anatomical site is incorrectly identified, was this classified as correct or incorrect? In the Results section (lines 114–125 and 150–167), the comparison of diagnostic performance against chance ($H_0 = 0.50$) requires stronger justification, as clinical interpretation of sensitivity and specificity is typically not framed in this way. Additionally, there is inconsistency between focusing on distal radius fractures (lines 69 and 199) and broader wrist abnormalities (lines 58–60), which should be aligned with the stated aim of the study (lines 49–52).

The Discussion appropriately concludes that the evaluated AI platforms are not ready for independent clinical use; however, the limitations should be expanded to explicitly acknowledge the small sample size ($n=100$), retrospective design, and use of non-medical-grade AI systems (lines 191–196). Language editing is required throughout the manuscript, as several grammatical and formatting issues reduce clarity—for example, “recognised have correctly recognise” (line 75) and inconsistent spacing and formatting

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

across tables (Tables 1–8). Terminology should also be standardised (AI vs Al in lines 31–35). Overall, the study is relevant but requires methodological clarification, improved statistical justification, and careful language revision before it can be considered for publication.