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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for inviting me to review this interesting and well-written article. The research is sound throughout and the topic will be of interest to the readership and the comments below are for minor amendments only.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes this is a clearly well written introduction leading to a relevant and succinct question

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Yes although it would be good to see some justification for the wash out period. Also some justification that the wash out period is sufficient to allow no carry over effects. This is currently missing and may just need to be an acknowledgement of the limits of this study.

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes in the main. Please would it be possible to add about the level of significance between splints for the grip measure, COPM in the text. All tables are presented well and contain detailed description of the results.

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

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes however, the inclusion criteria used does not state that a diagnosis of OA or RA was required, just wrist pain. The discussion, in part, refers only to OA and RA wrists. This would benefit from re-writing to ensure that this is consistent throughout.
   The justification of wrist splints being beneficial relates only to RA and the analyses did not analyse per diagnostic group so the reference to Hackett needs to be worked in differently as the authors did not carry out a diagnostic specific analysis.
   The authors discuss effectiveness and efficacy interchangeably and I suspect that the study is concerned with effectiveness so would suggest that this should
be consistent.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Yes although a short section on effectiveness of wash out would be beneficial

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 Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?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

9. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes – clear and well written throughout – thank you!