Reviewer’s report

Title: Validating a transnational fracture treatment registry using a standardized method

Version: 1 Date: 28 Sep 2019

Reviewer: Jürgen Stausberg

Reviewer's report:

The manuscript improved significantly through the revision. However, the use of the English language could be further enhanced. There are a few points added in the revision that are unclear.

1. The approach of Nonnemacher et al. was not developed in a „German Institute for Population Medicine“. Moreover, it is unclear what institute is meant with the denomination.

2. Confidence intervals are mentioned at the end of the result's section, but not reported. The intervals should be presented in the manuscript.

3. „As the method of adaptive monitoring has yet only been applied on two registries“. It is unknown how often the method was used. One might say, „The application of the method of adaptive monitoring was published only for two registries."

4. Hyphens are always followed by additional space as in „BFCC- project“. If a hyphen is used to concatenate two words, the space should be omitted.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I was co-author of the method applied by the authors.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal