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Reviewer's report:

The authors included the majority of the comments into their manuscript and provided all the necessary changes and modifications.

Nevertheless the authors often commented that randomisation will account for a equal distribution between the groups - if such big efforts are made in a rct, it is not only the question if group a differs from group b but also , are the results comparable to other studies - and which cast method is the best or appropriate one .which cast method leads to the lowest conversion rate to surgery.

Here the reviewers can only give a recommendation from their experience from their RCTs !

- one thing will be interesting : does volar flexion position lead to a greater extent of loss of reduction - an AE?- here the comparison of intensifier magnification pictures to the immediate post reduction x ray is interesting - on the other hand :will dorsal extension position in the wrist joint will result in a greater initial dorsal angulation of the distal radius? - lower rate of loss of reduction?

- In which position the secondary conversion to surgery is lower?

- In rcts dealing with DRF the regain of the functional status is an important point

- Is re reduction allowed in a case of relevant secondary dislocation following adequate position in the intensive magnifier to the post reduction x ray?

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.

Unable to assess

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:
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