Reviewer’s report

Title: Comparison of functional metacarpal splint and ulnar gutter splint in the treatment of fifth metacarpal neck fractures: A prospective comparative study

Version: 0 Date: 27 Jan 2019

Reviewer: David Warwick

Reviewer's report:

STRONG POINTS
* A useful paper with an outcome that can be applied to clinical practice
* Appropriate outcome measures
* Reasonable sample size
* Proper Ethics approval and informed consent
* Useful illustrations

POINTS TO IMPROVE
* Explain the allocation process (lines 112-115.) Was this quasi-randomisation? Why not simply randomize.
* Remove figure 5 which is superfluous

POINTS THAT CANNOT BE IMPROVED
* Not properly randomized, just sequential alternative allocation. There should, in theory, be no risk of bias.
* Quite high loss to follow up (18/58) but not surprising in this particular fracture pattern (young fighters!)
* Ideally there should have been a third arm- no splint at all. My hunch is that this would have been the best treatment of all

CONCLUSION
* Accept

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:
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