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Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: Other

If other, please specify:

research article

Has the case been reported coherently?: No

Is the case report authentic?: Yes

Is the case report ethical?: Yes

Is there any missing information that you think must be added before publication?: Yes

Is this case worth reporting?: Yes

Is the case report persuasive?: Yes

Does the case report have explanatory value?: No

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: No

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: No

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

Thank you for your efforts in reporting your patients with revision total hip arthroplasty using ceramic revision heads with a metallic sleeve and retained a well fixed stem. I am sorry to tell that there are some issues that decrease enthusiasm for publication of this manuscript as it is without revision:

GENERAL COMMENTS:

1- The use of English in the manuscript is suboptimal.
2- The title (Revision in total hip arthroplasty using a ceramic revision head) did not present well the actual work which is (revision hip arthroplasty using a ceramic revision head with a retained well-fixed femoral component).

3- The arrangement of the manuscript is strange with the methods at the end.

4- It was difficult for me to determine the type of the study pro- or retrospective.

Revisions necessary for publication:

1- In the Abstract section:
- The first paragraph: (It is known that a well-fixed stem can be left in situ when only the acetabular component and femoral head have to be changed), Is this become a standard or it is still a controversy, or at the maximum, a recommendation of some researchers.

2- In the "Results" section:
A- The first paragraph: (The mean follow-up period for the clinical and radiological examination was 26.7 months):
- What this means?
- No data about the follow-up protocol.
- The follow-up extends more than 2 years for some patients, but, the reported results only present 2 years. Why not at the end of follow-up?

B- The third paragraph: (The values for pain improved) which values timing or severity?

C- The fourth paragraph: The patient with mental problem is not a good candidate for evaluation by questionnaires, so, he need to be excluded from the start.

D- The 6th paragraph:
- (Neither an intraoperative nor a complication at the two year follow-up): grammatical error
- the authors reported no complications then they wrote (One patient had a decubital ulcer). Is this a complication or what?

3- In the "Discussion" section, the authors compared the results of their study to those of other studies and reported agreement with their results, despite the great difference in the number of cases, no statistical analysis or P values presented. The limited number of cases may represent a problem in this issue.

4- In the "Conclusion" section, the authors reported (Thus, a ceramic revision head is a very interesting option in a revision case. However, we reported short term results of a very small study group). This is a very powerful conclusion that may be not suitable to the great weakness they reported about the short term and the very small number of cases:

5- In the "Methods" section:
A- It is not clear whether this study was carried on a pro- or retrospective basis.
B- The first paragraph:
- The patient demographics were poorly presented and I think that a small table can present it in a simpler way for the readers.
- The authors mentioned in the first sentence (a revision surgery of a ceramic head was performed) but, later they reported (The reason for revision was a loosening of the cup in five patients) So, the revision was not (of the ceramic head).
- No hint about the pre-operative evaluation especially for the criteria upon which the stem considered to be well fixed, the inclusion and exclusion criteria.
- The operations were done in 2 hospitals; Is there any operative protocol to be followed by the different surgical teams, and where the follow up was done and by whom.
- The authors spent most of the methods section to discuss the advantages of the used implants can be placed in the introduction or the discussion sections to not dissociate the authors and the readers about the main goal of the METHODS section for presentation of the patient demographics, evaluation systems, surgical techniques, and the follow up protocol.

B- The second paragraph:
- the authors mentioned (After two years, a radiological and clinical follow-up) Is this the only follow up done.
- (the radiographs were checked for osteolysis and heterotopic ossifications) Is there any other data to be evaluated?, Is there any comparison done with the immediate post-operative radiograph?, and which evaluation system or criteria was used.

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

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Declaration of competing interests:**
I declare that I have no competing interests