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Dear reviewers,
thank you very much for your comments to improve the manuscript

Reviewers comments to the article:
The minimal invasive direct anterior approach in combination with large heads in total hip arthroplasty - is dislocation still a major issue? a case control study

Dear authors,
thanks, for the outstanding publication to the results of minimally invasive surgery combined with the direct anterior approach. This paper we would recommend to publish in BMC after minor essential revisions.
1. Please address in the paper the type of endoprosthesis you used. done
2. Add one or two examples of hip prosthesis used in the study
3. Please, address in the discussion part, that this publication based on an controlled examination. added in the discussion part
4. Add and discuss the fact whether the approach or the use of the big heads are related to the low dislocation rate. For example discuss the dislocation rate in the anterolateral approach technique, where the abductor muscle is spared. added in the text
5. Please add in the discussion, if wended any extra enlarged heads > 36mm in regard to the excellent results we reach with the use of 36mm heads. statement that we do not use larger heads is added

Please correct the publication in the abstract according to our recommendation:
1. Abstract, first part: ....reporting results with the use of different head sizes, tribologic and functional ... done
2. Address the used prosthesis in the method part. product names are added
3. I would rather suggest to add the patient age (min.-maximum) done
4. Part background: Is the better range of movement studied in relation of movement of the hip or in relation to walking? Please, make distinction to this fact or delete mentioned is the range of motion of the hip, added in the text

5. ....the DAA was associated with better results in regard... done
6. Results, abstract 5, please discuss the use of head sizes in regard to poly wear rate in bigger heads done literature number 35 is dealing with larger heads then 36 mm, a critical statement for the use of larger heads then 36 mm is added
7. Results, abstract 6, please add if there are any reasons of periprosthetic osteolysis in the three cases. added, the three cases with aseptic loosening are described

8. Part complication: Please address the surgical technique, approach of the femoral stem revision. done

9. Part discussion: in cadaver study......, no limitation in the quality of bone cement*, Please clarify this phrase. I explained this statement in more detail
10. Is there any statement why the „manufacturers ceased to produce bigger head sizes“?
yes it is added