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The Authors present a nice series of distal radius fractures with metaphyseal comminution. They describe a technique, but the description is not such that the technique is really reproducible. The use of a screw to apply distraction with a spreader is only understandable, when looking at the Images. There is no description how the plate stays aligned, was it temporarily fixed with a screw in the gliding hole or was it aligned with a clamp. This is the most important information when the Reader wants to apply this technique.

Abstract: the AO/OTA classification should be used when describing the fracture pattern. After the results usually there is a conclusion and not a discussion. The conclusions drawn from this paper is not reproducible out of the results. The results describe radiological outcome and functional parameters, but in the Conclusion you describe several shortcomings which were not measured (C-arm time, technical dependency (what does this mean??) and cosmesis. The conclusion could be, "With your technique we could obtain good reduction and healing in these complex fractures ......... (but the description should be reproducible, eg, with a drawing)

The Background: The last part of the Background is barely understandable, what means e.g. own methods in this context, or what is the meaning of active reduction technique, what are provisional indications??
Material methods: follow up greater than 36 months, better more than 36 months. The sentence Almost cases were performed .............. is not understandable aso.
The part Intraop decision should be shortened.
The description of the Operation should be more detailed that the technique is reproducible.
The Results: this part is much too long. The tables are clear enough and the results could be shortened.
The Discussion is too long, has redundancies and the part about the 3.5 mm plates can be omitted.
The part of the intraarticular fracture Fixation is not understandable. The Limitations of the study should be addressed more focused.

Conclusion: You suggest that the achieved results caused a better outcome than conventional techniques, however in the discussion part you write that "the PQ technique was not proven by direct comparison with the direct technique", and that other authors had the same results with the conventional technique (19-21).

The material you present and the suggested technique is worth to be published, but you should use e.g. the STROBE protocol to structure your paper and to use professional Support for editing the paper into a proper English.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
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