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General comments;

This is a very interesting paper on an understudied area of wrist fracture.

I would recommend a number of changes and clarifications in the paper;

The aim needs to be rephrased to make it more focused to the scope of the paper, , this should be done in the abstract and the introduction/background sections.

For example the aim of this study was to describe…..

Line 106, how were the 6 hospitals comparable - how was this determined by the researcher team?

Did the one ethics committee give ethical approval for all of the 6 participating hospitals, please clarify if this was the case.

Line 112/113 - it is not clear who conducted the assessments, this would be helpful, was it a nurse doctor, researcher - please add this detail

Line 120 - clarify which scales were self report.

Line 127/128 - add details relating to who conducted the assessments at baseline and follow-up?

Line 129 - the authors refer the reader to reference 10 with more details of the methodology but the reference describes a hip fracture study - please review.
Line 130 - clarify the definition of 'functionality' do the authors mean functional independence - review the use of this term throughout the manuscript.

Line 142/143 - provide references for the Spanish versions of the scales referred to.

Line 151-160 - provide additional detail regarding the cut off scores used by the authors, how were these determined?

Line 161-165 - provide additional detail regarding the cut off scores used by the authors for the PRO measure, how were these determined? Are these established cut offs - were they determined following statistical advice

Line 194 - what was the typical duration of a treatment session? How was this variable collected, was it from charts, for example for those referred to rehab was a typical duration 15-20 minutes? Is it possible to add ore details relating to the treatment and rehabilitation variables?

Line 231 - the use of the term 'autonomous' is confusing, do the authors mean independent/related, might be preferable to use another term.

Line 268 - what types of 'treatment' were used, could more detail be added here? Assume tis refers to surgical vs. conservative management of the fracture. Please ensure that is clear in the manuscript.

Line 286 - the authors refer to frail patients, how do they propose that an assessment of frailty could be incorporated in the management of wrist fracture patients?

Minor changes

Abstract, Methods section, suggested change to the line 46… A prospective cohort study, rather than the phrase was set up, suggest this be changed to 'was conducted'.

Methods section of abstract - last line add follow-up 'period'? Line 53

Keywords - suggest add the word 'elderly' to the list of key words line 66

Acknowledgments - suggest change the line 76 to ' The authors wish to thank…. 

Line 99 A study …. 'was conducted' rather than 'put in place'

Line 103 - correct English, where they 'sought' medical attention

Line 108, due to a previous syncope episode, add the word 'episode'

Line 111, change losses to 'lost to'
Line 181 change studied patients to 'The study participants'

Line 260 - there is a typo on this line, please review.

Line 289 - typo add 'the most'

Figure 1 - There is some text missing in the last box, review size of box.

Recommend accept with minor essential changes

**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.

Unable to assess

**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
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