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Reviewer's report:

1. Will the study design adequately address the hypothesis?
Yes. Overall a well-designed study. Did the authors consider an additional non-operative comparison arm or is there now sufficient lack of equipoise to rule out conservative management in uncomplicated dislocated clavicular fractures.

2. Are sufficient details provided to allow replication of the work or comparison with related analyses? No. If not what is missing?
A reviewer has requested that under Randomization, could the authors specifically state when the randomization occurs; is this prior to going to surgery, i.e. the doctor's office, or is it in the operating room. (major compulsory revision)
The same reviewer suggests that the pain diaries lack detail - they don't really state how often they should fill it out. Could more details be provided. (minor essential revision)

3. Is the planned statistical analysis adequate? The powering of this trial is based on a difference of 6 points on the DASH between two operative arms. This is a relatively large effect size and given the comparison is of active treatments the result may fail to show a statistical significant difference if the effect size is small. Could the authors please comment. Are there other trials that have compared active operative treatments using the DASH? Is the DASH sufficiently sensitive to compare active treatments in clavicular fractures?

4. Is the writing acceptable? The writing could be improved throughout. The statistical methods paragraph is not acceptable. Yes, however, they use the abbreviation, TEN, for Titanium Elastic Nail. Can this be modified? There are spelling errors (analgetics instead of analgesics, continuing variables instead of continuous variables).

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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