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**Reviewer’s report:**

Review of revised manuscript entitled “Factors influencing inpatient rehabilitation length of stay following revision hip replacements: A retrospective study” by Yeung et al.

The authors put a lot of work into revising the manuscript and responding to the reviewers’ comments. I believe the resulting article is much improved. I only have a few minor suggestions:

- Add “Statistically” significant to the beginning of the 2nd sentence of the Abstract Results. The ensuing list of significant predictors was identified via p < .05 alone; i.e. while the estimated longer (3.5 days) LOS associated with acetabular+femoral revision was not statistically significant, it does convey clinical significance.

- Identify the dependent variable (LOS) in the titles of Tables 4 & 5.

- Include the reference category (acetabular) with the two dummy-coded categories of the revision variable in Tables 4 & 5. The most common approach is to include the label of the reference category above the other two, put a value of 0.00 for the regression coefficient, and indent the dummy labels. See example below…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model b S.E. B p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revision (Acetabular) 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acetabular &amp; Femoral 3.53 2.40 0.11 .143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femoral 6.43 2.84 0.17 .025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission FIM scores -0.44 0.09 -0.31 &lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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