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Reviewer's report:

The study is well designed with defined study criteria. The findings of the study were limited by the quality of the five studies that were included in the systematic review. The authors should provide more description in the criteria use to appraise the questionnaire. Otherwise, the authors provide a good assessment of the existing PRO and studies available in a field that is in its infancy.

Introduction

Minor Essential Revisions: Page 3, paragraph 1, line 7: “But also on older patients…” Hip arthroscopy to postpone hip replacement is controversial. Long-term studies to support this statement are lacking.

Discretionary Revisions: Page 4, paragraph 1, line 1: It should be mentioned that most of the existing PRO were designed for hip osteoarthritis.

Methods

Minor Essential Revisions: Page 5, paragraph 3, line 1: Were meeting abstracts also searched?

Major Compulsory Revisions: Page 6, paragraph 4, line 5: How did the reviewers judge ratings for the psychometric properties? Was there any criteria? Please explain.

Minor Essential Revisions: Page 8, paragraph 2, line 7: “propertie” is misspelled.

Discussion

Discretionary Revisions: Page 11, paragraph 1, line 2: Conclusion that the NAHS is better quality questionnaire and the articles by Martin et al. are higher quality is repeated several times in the discussion.

Minor Essential Revisions: Page 11, paragraph 1, line 4: Please explain why the NAHS developed for hip pain is a disadvantage compared to the HOS. The NAHS may be more generalizeable than the other scores.

Major Compulsory Revisions: Page 11, paragraph 1, line 5: Biases introduced by the Martin et al. studies needs to be emphasized as this may compromise the reliability and validity of the HOS. This is a significant limitation of the Martin
study but also a limitation of the present study.

Major Compulsory Revisions: Page 12, paragraph 1, line 5: The authors should also state that the quality of the systematic review depends on the quality of the studies included. More rigorous studies to determine which score is most valid and reliable are necessary to provide a conclusive recommendation.
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