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Reviewer's report:

First, I need to congratulate the authors for their excellent work in this attractive field of total hip arthroplasty. The manuscript is well structured and easy to read. There are, however, some topics that require additional clarification and attention.

Major Compulsory Revisions

Methods
Page 6, Line 143: Please provide a concise description of modular femoral neck (material, dimensions, type of locking). Discuss the problems of fully modular stem design in THA later on in Discussion section.

Page 7, Lines 150: Who performed the surgery? A single surgeon at one institution or was this a multi-center study? Who performed postoperative evaluation – the surgeon who treated the patients or an unbiased examiner?

Page 7, Lines 155-164: Long descriptions of HHS and WOMAC score should be deleted.

In the Results section you stated that all implants were stable on X-rays. How and when did you perform and evaluate X-ray analysis? Please give details.

Results and Discussion
Page 9, Line 205: Table 3 is very busy. Consider producing a graph instead.


Page 12, Line 294: The major drawback of this study is the non-randomized design. Please state this clearly and elaborate further in the Conclusion section.

Minor Essential Revisions

Methods
Page 6, Line 136: Please give an exact name of the implant and follow it through the whole text (Cut or CUT?)

Page 7, Line 151: Please correct wording (FoOne)
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests.