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General

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. P. 4. The objective aims to compare with osteotomy bone fusion and arthroscopy; I cannot find the results of those studies anywhere.

2. P. 5. The search strategy needs to be described more fully, perhaps as an appendix.

3. P. 5. This review is obsolete. It is now mid 2004. The search must be updated through early 2004.

4. P. 5. How were the unpublished studies located?

5. P. 6. Were non-English studies excluded based on an a priori decision, or were there simply no non-English studies found?

6. P. 6. The inclusion and exclusion criteria should specify types of patients included, as well as types of studies included (i.e., decision to review only systematic reviews for THR).

6. P. 6. I am a little confused why the numbers of included studies differ in this and your 2002 publication.

7. P. 7. More data on quality of the included studies, and systematic reviews should be included, either in the tables themselves (preferred) or in the text.

8. P. 7. When discussing unpublished studies, it is inappropriate to refer to your previous review. This publication should stand on its own. How did you obtain this information? Personal communication? Industry databases?

9. P. 8. This section is poorly organized. Perhaps you could organize by outcomes, or add sub-headings (if allowed by the journal).

10. Table 1. Again, specify more details on inclusion (types of patients, types of studies, language restrictions). Why did you vary the length of follow-up for the different treatment options? Ideally, outcomes should be assessed at the same time point.

11. Table 2. How are serious complications defined? What are normal activities? How is quality of life defined? Also, cost would be another important outcome.
12. Table 3. This table is unnecessary. Study design should be incorporated in Table 4.

13. Table 4. This table should include details of study design, length of follow-up, population, quality, and source of funding.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No

Declaration of competing interests:

None