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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the paper entitled, “Risk Factors for Revision of Primary Total Hip Arthroplasty: A Systematic Review”

I find this manuscript very well written and easy to follow. I think it addresses an important topic. There are great limitations of these reviews but largely bc of the quality of the published literature reviewed and the heterogeneity within those publications. The authors have a done nice job synthesizing their findings.

Minor points.

1. I am not clear on the last line of the introduction, how can we promote preventative measures? Do you mean for the patient or surgeon? I don’t see any modifiable risk factors identified on the patient side?

2. Was the search performed in duplicate? I believe that helps limit missed papers.

3. In the results, the authors mention a paper was excluded bc of, ‘revision for any reason other than infection’. I would like to understand further why it was removed? Would this not fit with the authors outcome of interest?

4. Pls make clear the RA vs AVN comparison. Is this RA (no AVN) vs OA w AVN? Of course, RA could have AVN also so it is unclear.

5. I would suggest removing the DDH vs OA comparison as it this comparison has many potential confounding factors. Is this high riding DDH vs a low subluxation/dislocation? Are these THR for DDH performed with a high hip centre or not? This would have the potential for implant longevity given the smaller cups used with a high hip centre.
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