MATTERS ARISING

Open Access



Letter to the Editor Regarding "Effects of Jintiange on the healing of osteoporotic fractures in aged rats"

Yunzhuan Luo¹, Xin Liu¹ and Zujian Xu^{1*}

The recent study "Effects of Jintiange on the healing of osteoporotic fractures in aged rats" [1] provides preliminary insights into the potential therapeutic role of Jintiange (artificial tiger bone) in osteoporotic fracture repair. However, several methodological and interpretative limitations undermine the robustness of its conclusions. This commentary aims to address these concerns, focusing on five critical issues that require clarification or further investigation.

Inadequate group design: absence of essential controls

The study utilized only two groups: an ovariectomyinduced osteoporosis (OVX) model group treated with Jintiange and an untreated OVX control group. The lack of blank controls (sham-operated rats without OVX) and positive controls (e.g., bisphosphonates or teriparatide) makes it impossible to distinguish between the drug's efficacy, model-specific pathological changes, or placebo effects [2] Similar osteoporosis-related studies consistently underscore the critical requirement for incorporating multi-arm experimental designs in research protocols.

*Correspondence:

Zujian Xu

xuzujian@21cn.com

Unverified mechanism: lack of direct evidence on osteoclast inhibition

The authors hypothesize that Jintiange restores the "balance between bone resorption and formation." However, the study solely measured osteogenesis-related markers (e.g., BV/TV, Tb.N) without assessing osteoclast activity (e.g., TRACP5b, RANKL / OPG ratio) [3]. Without such data, the conclusion that Jintiange "restores balance" remains speculative. Future work should include tartrateresistant acid phosphatase (TRAP) staining and dynamic bone turnover markers to clarify its dual action [4].

Subjective fracture healing criteria: overreliance on imaging and non-validated scores

Fracture healing was evaluated using micro-CT parameters (e.g., BV/TV) and a proprietary scoring system, but these lack validation against gold-standard methods. Micro-CT limitations: While micro-CT quantifies trabecular architecture, it cannot assess mechanical strength or collagen maturation, which are critical for functional healing. Complementary biomechanical testing (e.g., three-point bending) or histology (e.g., Safranin O staining for callus maturity) is required [5]. Scoring system validity: The described scoring table (e.g., "0-2points for callus formation ") lacks reference to established scales like the Radiographic Union Score for Tibial fractures (RUST) or Lane-Sandhu criteria. Non-blinded assessments further risk observer bias, as noted in guidelines for orthopedic animal studies [2]. These limitations question the reliability of the healing outcomes. Standardized, blinded evaluations with multi-modal validation are imperative.



© The Author(s) 2025. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License, which permits any non-commercial use, sharing, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if you modified the licensed material. You do not have permission under this licence to share adapted material derived from this article or parts of it. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/.

¹Department of Orthopedics, The Affiliated Traditional Chinese Medicine Hospital of Southwest Medical University, Longmatan District, Xianglin Road, No. 182, Luzhou City 646000, Sichuan Province, People's Republic of China

Unjustified dosage selection and absence of Dose-Response data

The study administered a single Jintiange dose (50 mg/kg/day) without justifying its selection or exploring doseresponse relationships. This raises two issues: **Toxicity vs. Efficacy**: High mortality rates (exact numbers unreported) were attributed to "aged rat frailty, " but no data excluded drug toxicity. Dose-ranging studies (e.g., 25, 50, 100 mg/kg) are needed to identify optimal therapeutic windows and assess safety. **Clinical translation**: Humanequivalent dosing requires pharmacokinetic data, which are absent. Previous trials of similar traditional medicines emphasize the necessity of dose optimization to avoid under-/over-treatment.

Unexplained mortality: potential link to drug toxicity

The mortality rate in treated rats was mentioned but inadequately analyzed. While aging and surgical stress may contribute, the possibility of Jintiange-related toxicity cannot be dismissed without: **Histopathological data**: Organ toxicity assessments (e.g., liver, kidney) to exclude drug-induced damage. **Pharmacokinetics**: Plasma concentration monitoring to ensure doses remain within safe thresholds. Similar studies on herbal compounds (e.g., Epimedium extracts) have reported hepatotoxicity at high doses, underscoring the need for rigorous safety profiling [6].

Acknowledgements None.

Author contributions

YZ.L: Conceptualization; formal analysis; methodology; writing—original draft. X.L: Conceptualization; methodology; validation; writing—review and editing. ZJ.X: Conceptualization; formal analysis; methodology; validation; writing review and editing. All authors reviewed the manuscript.

Funding

No funding related to this manuscript was received.

Data availability

No datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate Not applicable.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Received: 11 May 2025 / Accepted: 13 May 2025 Published online: 27 May 2025

References

- Liu J, Liu TT, Zhang H C, et al. Effects of Jintiange on the healing of osteoporotic fractures in aged rats. J Orthop Surg Res. 2024;19(1):828.
- Gorter E A, Reinders C R, Krijnen P, et al. The effect of osteoporosis and its treatment on fracture healing a systematic review of animal and clinical studies. Bone Rep. 2021;15:101117.
- Simic M K, Mohanty S T, Xiao Y, et al. Multi-Targeting DKK1 and LRP6 prevents bone loss and improves fracture resistance in multiple myeloma. J Bone Min Res. 2023;38(6):814–28.
- Na C, Ao D. MiR-331-3p facilitates osteoporosis and May promote osteoporotic fractures by modulating NRP2 expression. J Orthop Surg Res. 2024;19(1):487.
- Ji H, Shen G, Liu H, et al. Biodegradable Zn-2Cu-0.5Zr alloy promotes the bone repair of senile osteoporotic fractures via the immune-modulation of macrophages. Bioact Mater. 2024;38:422–37.
- Wang Y, Zhao M, Li B, et al. Advances in the mechanism of emodin-induced hepatotoxicity. Heliyon. 2024;10(13):e33631.

Publisher's note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.