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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions: The authors have satisfactorily commented on the quality assessment tools used. However why do they not use a cut of value? They state that the maximum score is 14 on their scale, you can argue that a score of 50% or more (> 6) is an adequate study. (van Tulder et al. Spine 2003). I would suggest to include only adequate studies in the review. Than you avoid the conclusion that all studies were of low methodological quality, and makes the review outcome stronger. If the authors choose to use the GRADE methodology than this should also be mentioned in the methods paragraph and the outcomes in the results paragraph.

Minor essential revisions: abstract: studies with mobile bearing prosthesis were included. Does that mean that no Northern American studies for TAA (using fixed bearing) were considered to fit this review? Please comment

Discretionary revisions:
One of the included TAA was conducted by one of the authors of this review. To avoid conflict of interest I would suggest to use an independent quality assessor to score this study.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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