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Reviewer's report:

In my opinion the authors have addressed the questions posed by reviewers. Regarding my proposals, the main criticisms, i.e. secondary outcomes (not reported in the first manuscript), age range of patients included, have been adequately answered.

In the Discussion part, limitations, and additional explanations of several aspects of the studies included, are reported, or are suggested as 'needed to be addressed' in future studies, as type of studies included (randomised and retrospective observational), type of surgical procedures - minimally invasive vs. invasive-, type of anesthetic procedure -iv general, inhalational, sedation plus neuraxial, etc. I recommend the recently published (not necessary to be added by authors): Fracture fixation in the operative management of hip fractures (FAITH): an international, multicentre, randomised controlled trial. Fixation using Alternative Implants for the Treatment of Hip fractures (FAITH) Investigators. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(17)30066-1. Lancet Volume 389, No. 10078, p1519-1527.

In this sense I would suggest to recommend to add studies comparing low dose vs standard dose spinal anesthesia (again not to be included in the present metaanalysis):


Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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