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Reviewer’s report:

Although the authors insist their own way presenting their study personnel, member of data and safety monitoring board is lacking. This is an important committee monitoring the correct conduction of the trial. Please specify.

I still think this should be an open label study, because the patients may easily know what kind of implants are used on the X-ray, especially when they clearly know two different implants are to be used in the consent form.

We still think a blinded evaluator is necessary, because the patient may know his treatment method. We suggest a third-party evaluator who examine the patients without seeing the X-ray or knowing about the treatment method.


We all know that the follow-up rate of joint replacement had better be at least 5 years. Although the mortality rate in this kind of patients is high, 2-year follow up may detect some more interesting differences, like loosening or protrusion rate, etc.

Please add the method of survival analysis to the statistics of the protocol.

The prosthesis had better be the same to eliminate the possible differences. It has been postulated that unipolar head tends to cause more acetabular protrusion than bipolar head. I don’t know whether the head design of these two prostheses is similar or else?

I suggest the details of the prostheses should be described.
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