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**Reviewer's report:**

Decent English language has been used. However, there are many grammatical errors that should be corrected by a native speaker.

It is surprising that the author is describing about a new method but Rimell JT et al J Biomed Mater Res. 2000;53(4):414-20. et al already described it 2000. This paper is even not mentioned in the introduction. This may contribute to the good quality of the Journal and may let the reader feel a relation of the papers published. The aim of this study was to compare UHMW-PE implant with titanium mesh, but there was not mentioned, how the authors controlled the position of the implant. Do they use navigation?

Lacking information:

But lacks a final clinical photo a final proper clinical photo to describe the success of individually manufacture UHMW-PE implant, it’s difficult for the reader to understand. I wonder how the author could measure the success of the treatment without radiographic proof. As well known the ultra-high molecular weight polyethylene sheets have not a radioopacity.

Who accurate was the production of the CAD models? Who bent the titanium meshes. Which approach was used? Why is the follow-up time selected 6 month? Polyethylene sheets starts to resorb after one year. Please provide the one year results.

More detailed are required in the figure legend.

I felt that the paper took too many assumptions on the reader. A clearer explanation and approach is required.

The lack of open minded and critical analysis is stated by the analysis of references in which 6 references are self references by Kozakiewicz M.

Otherwise a good article that merits publication, after major revisions
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