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Reviewer's report:

Thank you very much for the opportunity to review this study protocol. The authors want to compare two different types of casts in distal radius fracture in elderly patients.

Some comments:

It is a very important topic. It is a prospective, multi-center study. Randomized. Blinding not possible / very difficult. Intra- and extraarticular fractures will be separately randomized (blocks). Good outcome parameters.

1. Will the study design adequately test the hypothesis: yes

2. Are sufficient details provided to allow replication of the work or comparison with related analyses: if not, what is missing? Please clearly describe "primarily stable, reducible DRF" (so, exclude DRF with ulnar styloid fracture? What is your threshold of dorsal angulation?). Please exclude patients with concomitant fractures at the same arm (finger, carpal, proximal to the DRF).

3. Is the planned statistical analysis appropriate: yes. In multivariate analyses you need to control for age, sex, dorsal angulation and comminuted fractures.

4. Is the writing acceptable: yes

One question: The topic is elderly patients. The authors chose age threshold 65 years, better 70?

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.
Yes

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:

Acceptable
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