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Responses to Editor’s Comments

We would like to express our sincere thanks to the editor for constructive and positive comments.

Response to editor’s comments:

At this point, I have gone through the manuscript and made numerous edits throughout using the PDF annotation tools. These are primarily for grammar, clarity and style. Please carefully go through the attached PDF, checking that each edit reflects the authors’ original meaning, and incorporating it into the manuscript.

Response: Thank you for your excellent and constructive edits. We have incorporated them into the manuscript and have also noted all changes/additions by using red text

1) Please clarify this difference. Were routine tests (eg. CBC) performed more frequently in the ITP group? Or were a wider range of tests performed in the ITP vs non-ITP group?

Response: Thank you for your excellent comment. We have re-described this sentence to reflect this comment as shown below:

Page 9, lines 131-132

Both groups received the same postoperative management except that routine hematological tests performed more frequently in the ITP group.

2) Given that the study design compared matched pairs, would it not be more appropriate to analyze differences between pairs using paired t test, Wilcoxon matched pairs test, and McNemar’s chi square, respectively?

Response: Thank you for your excellent comment. We have re-described the
appropriate statistical methods to reflect this comment as shown below:
Page 10, lines 164-165
The paired t test or the Wilcoxon matched pairs test was used to analyze continuous variables, and McNemar's chi square test was used to analyze dichotomous values.

3) Please note that p values should be denoted using a lower case p throughout the manuscript.
Response: Thank you for comment. We have used a lower case p throughout the manuscript to reflect this comment.

4) I'm not sure that there was any analysis of perioperative management criteria performed? It would appear that the authors simply followed established guidelines and/or common practice in terms of obtaining extended pre-operative bloodwork and triggers for pre-operative PRBC/PC transfusion and/or IVIG therapy. Please clarify?
Response: Thank you for your excellent comment. We have re-described this sentence to reflect this comment as shown below:
Page 12, lines 205-206
Therefore, in the present study, we retrospectively analyzed clinical and radiographic results of THA in this patient population.

5) Please note this change made throughout the manuscript. Currently, it is generally considered preferable to described patients as having a particular disease (ie. patients with ITP), rather than defining them by their disease (ie. ITP patients). Please check that this change is made throughout.
Response: Thank you for comment. We have used ‘patients with ITP’ throughout the manuscript to reflect this comment.

6) Difficult to call these mid-term results when follow-up times are as short as 2 years.
Response: Thank you for your comment. We have removed ‘mid-term’ throughout the manuscript to reflect this comment.

We hope that we have addressed each of your concerns, and we would be happy to make any further changes that you deem necessary.