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Reviewer’s report:

A well written paper and an interesting study. There are a few minor revisions required as per below:

1. the title is too long - remove 'proximal to metaphyseal diaphyseal junction of fifth metatarsal bone' We understand you are reporting on a pseudo Jones fracture and you go on to explain its anatomical position clearly in the paper so it is not needed in the title.

2. Introduction - first sentence - after 'common injury' remove 'of the foot'. We know you are talking about the foot because you have already told us when you mention the fifth metatarsal. Also in the introduction - you need to start a new paragraph after references [2,14,17-19]. Also, after these references [2,14,17-19]. please remove 'have been done'.

3. Some of your in text references in parentheses require spacing - usually before the first parenthesis.

4. The subtitles (e.g. Trial Design - require subheading italics.

5. It may depend on the journal's requirements but you need to substitute 'patient' throughout with 'participant'.

6. I was unable to open supplementary information files, so i am wondering if you have provided patient information sheets and consent forms?

7. Under 'Treatment regimen and randomisation- line 24 to 30 - i wonder how participants could be in both groups? how could they have both casts on? it should read 'all participants had the cast removed...

8. Line 24 - 'Those in the both groups' remove 'the'.

9. Some used crutches, some did not. some had NSAIDs, some did not - effects of treatment and outcome on VAS/AOFAS scales could have been influenced by this and it needs to be discussed as a significant limitation of the study. Also, NSAIDs can delay bone union - discuss this possibility as a limitation.
10. If you applied intention to treat analysis, please show us the results and how many participants this was applied to

11. Line 46 and 49 - delete one of these.

12. The first 3 sentences of the results section are a repeat of methods - please delete.
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