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Reviewer's report:

The general topic of this study is of timely importance and fits to the scope of the journal addressing musculoskeletal surgeons, physiotherapists and general practitioners. HRA or THA is challenging in hip dysplasia. Patients are often at a relatively young age with high demands regarding daily (professional) activities or sports. Most criticism of HRA for this indication is early implant failure making secondary THA more complicated with greater bone stock loss and potential need of special oval shaped cups rather reserved for revision procedures. However the current literature still lacks good quality studies addressing the direct comparison of HRA and THA with their respective benefits and disadvantages as well as identifying relevant technical implantation modifications to improve surgery related outcome. This work shows a gross number of patients with different surgical interventions and modifications. However these various different interventions (including different radiographic procedures, surgeon’s experience and types of implants) pooled in one group make it for the interested reader impossible to elucidate the advantage and disadvantage of each modified intervention to achieve better outcome. Thus this study with in principal valuable contents contains too many different variables all put together leading to presently overall low quality of scientific content to justify publication. Thus rejection of the well-written manuscript is recommended.

I suggest to extensively rewrite the whole manuscript by splitting it into two shorter less content loaded more focused publications.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

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.
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Quality of written English
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