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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for inviting me to revise this article on periprosthetic fractures of the hip.

It is an interesting work because there are few series in the literature of periprosthetic fractures in only revision prosthesis with this follow up.

This series is composed of 11 cases treated for femoral periprosthetic fracture after femoral revision using a long stem. For the classification was used Vancouver classification (METHODS page 7 line 1). All 11 periprosthetic fractures were classified as Vancouver B1 (RESULTS page 8 line 4-5, DISCUSSION page 10 line 1). Because is successively affirmed that the most of the patients had poor quality bone at the level of the fracture, due to osteoporosis and previous surgeries (DISCUSSION p. 10 line 6-7), then I would think that these fractures were not Vancouver B1 but Vancouver B3 fractures. So either there was an error of initial classification of fractures or should be clarified better these concepts.

Furthermore the clinical evaluation was based on the Japanese Orthopedic Association score (JOA) (METHODS p. 7 line 7-8). Would be added in a table with the criteria taken into consideration or a bibliographical reference of the JOA score.

Always insert the references for each statement.

For example in the BACKGROUND on the claim (page 4 line 6): are a major complication of THA and BHA must add the bibliographic reference
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