



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_42283
Title of the Manuscript:	The Atraumatic Metatarsal Fracture: A Clinical Sign of Bisphosphonate-Associated Bone Fragility
Type of the Article	Review Paper

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>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The authors described the literature concerning the subject as well as the controversies regarding classification and diagnosis of bisphosphonate-associated atypical fractures. They strongly demonstrated, by means of the collected current literature on the topic, that atraumatic metatarsal fractures should be included as minor features defining the bisphosphonate-associated atypical femoral fractures. I recommend the publication of the manuscript, but only two points should be observed: - page 4, lines 85 to 86 – “References 19, 23, 25, 26, 27 and 28 refer to cases described in Table 1 but not otherwise discussed in the text.” Since the manuscript collected all papers available within the topic in the literature and presented in the table, I think this information is not necessary and should be removed; - References – (34) – the authors missed the title. “Elimination and Biochemical Responses to Intravenous Alendronate in Postmenopausal Osteoporosis.” In my opinion, with these minor corrections the manuscript could be following the next step to its publication.	We respect and appreciate the reviewers comments. As it happens, in publishing other review papers which included tables on this subject with ScienceDomaine, the editor and the copy editor have always enforced the house rule that no reference is permitted which is not mentioned *in the text*. They have interpreted this rule to mean that references in tables are not sufficient. The insertion of the lines mentioned was in compliance with this rule. The numbering is changed due to revisions required by another reviewer. We appreciate the discovery of the omission in reference 34 and have corrected the manuscript.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

