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Dear Editor,

First of all, we would like to thank you and the reviewers for the comments and suggestions to improve our paper.

Below we present a response to the comments of Reviewer 2. We hope that we have adequately dealt with all the comments and look forward to your response in due course.

Yours sincerely (on behalf of all co-authors),

Margot van der Grinten

Report Brian McGory

“no power analysis”

A section has been added to the discussion in which power analysis is described (page 11).

Before starting the study no power analysis was performed. All consecutive patients were included during the study period. An evaluation of functional outcome of both approaches was done 1 year after surgery. As the difference between the groups was small and the standard deviation is relatively large, the power of this study will be moderate.

“the conclusions do not follow the results of the paper”

In the latest revision of the paper a section was added in which the group TO was divided into patients with and without trochanteric union. The results of this division were not included in the abstract and in the conclusion. This has been changed.