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Reviewer's report:

I have only a few minor comments to be addressed in a revised manuscript before publication.

Minor Essential Revisions:

Line 167, 169, 171: “heterogeneity was obvious” it is not clear as to what it refers to as a stand alone sentence, particularly since the sentence is repeated several times within the paragraph and results sections

Please clarify in the text if the point estimates throughout the results are comparing BHA to THA, or vice versa? Even though most of the comparisons are non-significant, it is useful to know which treatment the point estimate favors. I realize this information is in the forest plots.

I am confused why the authors have reported both pooled results and individual study results within the secondary outcomes sections. I understand if they are unable to pool results for an outcome, but I do not understand the rationale for reporting both.

Line 251: the THA tended to be higher, however the WMD was often very small and likely not clinically significant. Please comment on the clinical significance of your results.

Comment on potential causes of the moderate-high heterogeneity seen in most of your results.

Discretionary Revisions:

Although I agree with the rationale for stratifying your analysis based on the different follow-up periods. It would be interesting to see the pooled analysis for all time points combined. This will give a large sample size and might give more power given the point estimates consistently marginally favored THA in each time period

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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