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**Reviewer's report:**

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The main issue for me is the short follow-up of this cohort, mean follow-up being just over 3 years. It is not clear how many patients are at risk at each year of the Kaplan-Meier curve. Please provide this information.

2. Has the amount of head downsize been measured? Please see:

   Grammatopoulos, G., et al., 2010. The relationship between head-neck ratio and pseudotumour formation in metal-on-metal resurfacing arthroplasty of the hip. Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery - British Volume, 92 (11), pp. 1527-1534. I believe this is important information and should be included.

3. Please give information on when the failures occurred, the evidence would suggest that a late neck fracture could be an indication of an adverse reaction to metal debris.

4. How can the authors be sure adverse reactions were not present if no histology results have been presented?

5. This reviewer does not understand what the authors mean by the ReCap being hemispherical. No metal-on-metal acetabular component is hemispherical, the included angle is always less than 180 degrees. Please explain.

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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

**Declaration of competing interests:**

My organisation has received research funding from implant manufacturers.