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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions: None

Minor Essential Revisions:
1) Line three of the Background section. “but has not evolved into general use since approximately two decades.” The insertion of “the last” or “the previous” before two decades might read a little clearer
2) Line 29 of the Background section. Substitution of the word “amount” with the word “number” might work better.
3) Line 32 of the Background section. Insertion of “the” or “a” between “not subject” would read better.

Discretionary Revisions:
1) First sentence of the second paragraph of the Background section. “The number of hip arthroscopies is rising because of improvements in…”. I think that a more appropriate statement would include mention of our improvements in surgical technique and a better understanding of the pathology associated with the hip joint, rather than just our improvements in equipment.
2) Lines 3-5 of the definitions section. I like the definitions section. However, the line about a patient’s perspective is not necessary there and may be better suited in the previous paragraph of the discussions section.
3) More about the discussions section. This article refers multiple times to the work of Terwee the psychometric properties he defined in his cited reference. This article is not readily available for many readers to reference for assistance with understanding of the definitions of the multiple psychometric properties. An addition of a separate table with a short list of definitions for each term seems warranted. It could be placed in the addendum section for readers to access should they chose. It would enhance the reader’s ability to understand the differences between the different PRO questionnaires.
4) The Study Selection section mentions the use of a third reviewer as a “tie-breaker” for studies which were unclear as to whether or not they should be included. The Discussion section mentions that the third reviewer was not necessary and that “reading errors” were the cause of confusion. It is just a little unclear as to whether or not he played a role in the process, and what criteria the
third reviewer would have used to “break the tie”. Please clarify.
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