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Reviewer's report:

Dear Editors of the BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders

Below is my revision of the manuscript:

No long-term impact of low-energy wrist fracture on health-related quality of life and global quality of life. A case-control study.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
Yes.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
Yes.

3. Are the data sound?
Yes.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Yes.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Yes.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Yes.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes. I suggest to add low energy to wrist fracture in the abstract conclusion.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes. Although few changes suggested (minor essential revisions):
- in the introduction of the main body of the manuscript I can not agree with the statement “Low-energy fracture in elderly patients may be devastating and impair both health related quality of life (HRQOL) and global quality of life (GQOL)”; also
the authors contradict such a strong statement with their results, thus removing the low-energy and replacement with just distal radius fracture would be wise
- in the introduction
the sentence - “And female patients with a wrist fracture aged 50 - 65 years reported decreased physical health about one year after the fracture.”
should be changed or removed
- in the conclusion of the main body of the manuscript change “small” trauma (too colloquial) into minor trauma

Other essential revisions.
The introduction part is too long, much of the data presented there fits the discussion, though I suggest the authors to change proportions and incorporate some of the valuable data into the discussion part. Example:
“Studies have shown that diseases or injuries (e.g. a wrist fracture), and HRQOL and GQOL have bidirectional relationships, though all are influenced by characteristics of the individual and the environment [10-14]. Furthermore, studies have shown that characteristics of the individuals and the environment influence HRQOL and GQOL differently, and non-medical factors seem to influence GQOL more than HRQOL [10,12-14].”

Final comments.
There are only few shortcomings in this paper which can easily be corrected if my suggestions are agreed upon.
The manuscript is worth publication:
- the title is consistent with the problem actually presented and brings the main message of the study,
- the abstract gives an adequate picture of the entire article,
- background made the subject understandable and purpose of the article was clearly stated
- the research design is appropriate and the methods clearly explained, with clear criteria for selecting representative sample
- data has been collected in a systematic and comprehensive manner
- statistical methodology is appropriate
- analysis of the data is systemic and interpretation of results is clearly presented and adequately supported by the evidence
- conclusions are logically valid and justified by the evidence
- references are up-to-date

Sincerely Pawel Grala
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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