



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	2014_AIR_14189
Title of the Manuscript:	Contact Analysis for Coupling of Plates and Screws in Fracture Fixation of Cortical Bone
Type of the Article	Short Research 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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>1. All result data charts have to contain scale numbers to present clearly the results (for example: scale data of bone length in numbers; fig 4, plate length in fig.5, circumference of the screw in fig 6).</p> <p>2. Incomplete title in figure 7 and the author has to present the stress distribution data box from his FEA program; the author has to present a complete view of the program.</p> <p>3. So little references in this paper the author has to provide much more references to support his ideas especially in the discussion part as it doesn't contain any reference support it.</p> <p>4. The author has to compare his result with other works to verify and validate the FEA model if there is no comparison with other simulation works then the author's simulation is questionable and not verified.</p>	<p>The authors than the reviewer for the positive comments and in depth analysis of the article.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We agree to that and data have been added in the Materials and Methods section.</li> <li>2. Figure 7 have been removed from the text. Mainly because it is repetition that we have reported before and the text describe the results better. Moreover, we supplied a new reference [12] which have simulation of the results.</li> <li>3. We agree to that and we have elaborated more in the discussion and added nine more references.</li> <li>4. We agree to this point. Comparison and validation have been done in previous work [9,13]. We added another paragraph in discussion comparing this model to other FE models and summarizing the</li> </ol>



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

		differences.
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	Chart data is more scientific if represented in box with different line shape rather than in arrows (fig.4, 5 and 6)	We agree to that and we have made these changes.
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		