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Reviewer’s report:

This article describes the satisfaction of patients with lateral ankle injuries, who have initially seen at a university emergency room, but were referred to their general practitioner compared with a group, who were further treated in the hospital. Both group had 50 groups and no differences were found between the groups two months after initially treatment

Major Compulsory Revisions

Many questions remain unanswered and need to be clarified
- Why did the authors not use the internationally accepted Ottawa rules but their own Bernese rules?
- How many radiographs were made? Was there any difference between the two groups?
- Were the patients randomized after clinical diagnoses or after clinical diagnoses and radiograph?
- What was the method of randomization?
- What was the null hypothesis (H0) of this study and on which power the number of patients. The reviewer has a strong impression that the study was underpowered to find differences between the two groups.
- Why was a follow-up of two months chosen? Follow-up studies show that the overall long-term results are less well, than generally assumed. A 12 months follow-up seems to be more reasonable.
- How many patients refused to participate to the study?
- Were patients informed about the study and how were they treated when they refused to participate?
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