



Fig. E-1
Illustrations showing the progression of fatigue failure of bone: normal bone (**Fig. E-1A**), stress reaction (**Fig. E-1B**), structural failure of bone with incomplete fracture line (**Fig. E-1C**), complete fracture line without displacement (**Fig. E-1D**), complete displaced fracture (**Fig. E-1E**), and nonunion (**Fig. E-1F**).

| TABLE E-1 Anatomic Sites for High-Risk Stress Fractures ⁸ |
|--|
| Femoral neck (tension side) |
| Patella (tension side) |
| Anterior tibial cortex |
| Medial malleolus |
| Talar neck |
| Dorsal tarsal navicular cortex |
| Fifth metatarsal proximal metaphysis |
| Sesamoids of the great toe |

TABLE E-2 Questionnaire Regarding Ease of Use and Relevancy

1. Was this classification system easy for you to remember? ___ Yes ___ No
2. Were the classification categories clearly defined? ___ Yes ___ No
3. Did you feel that this classification system was easily applicable to the cases presented? ___ Yes ___ No
4. Will this classification system facilitate communication between you and your medical colleagues with regard to stress fractures? ___ Yes ___ No
5. Would this classification system influence your management of the patients presented? ___ Yes ___ No
6. Would you anticipate this system aiding you in formulating a prognosis for the cases presented? ___ Yes ___ No
7. Would you use this classification system in your practice in the future? ___ Yes ___ No
8. Without reviewing the current classification system, please fill in “yes” or “no” with regard to the presence of pain and the correct phrase in the appropriate box for each fracture grade. A phrase bank is provided below. Phrases may be used more than once.

| Grade | Pain | Radiographic Findings (CT, MRI, Bone Scan, or Radiograph) |
|-------|------|---|
| I | | |
| II | | |
| III | | |
| IV | | |
| V | | |

Phrase Bank:

- Non-displaced fracture line on imaging
- Symptomatic with no fracture line on imaging
- Symptomatic with evidence of a nonunion
- Displaced fracture (>2 mm of displacement or separation)
- Asymptomatic with positive imaging study (incidental finding)

TABLE E-3 Interpretation of the Kappa Statistic*

| Kappa | Agreement |
|--------------|----------------------------|
| <0 | Less than chance agreement |
| 0.01 to 0.20 | Slight agreement |
| 0.21 to 0.40 | Fair agreement |
| 0.41 to 0.60 | Moderate agreement |
| 0.61 to 0.80 | Substantial agreement |
| 0.81 to 0.99 | Almost perfect agreement |

*Reproduced, with modification, from: Viera AJ, Garrett JM. Understanding interobserver agreement: the kappa statistic. *Fam Med.* 2005 May;37(5):360-3. Reprinted with permission.

| TABLE E-4 Questionnaire Results | |
|--|--|
| Question | No. of Evaluators (N = 15) Answering Yes |
| 1. Was this classification system easy for you to remember? | 14 (93.3%) |
| 2. Were the classification categories clearly defined? | 14 (93.3%) |
| 3. Did you feel that this classification system was easily applicable to the cases presented? | 13 (86.7%) |
| 4. Will this classification system facilitate communication between you and your medical colleagues with regard to stress fractures? | 14 (93.3%) |
| 5. Would this classification system influence your management of the patients presented? | 9 (60.0%) |
| 6. Would you anticipate this system aiding you in formulating a prognosis for the cases presented? | 11 (73.3%) |
| 7. Would you use this classification system in your practice in the future? | 14 (93.3%) |