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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the submission and allowing reviewer feedback. This manuscript provides sound and detailed technical notes in regard to hip resurfacing, as well as evidence on the efficacy of the procedure. This large sample size and longitudinal analysis allows for robust interpretation by the authors, and I commend them on their well-written work. I have a few minor comments and questions:

Editorial note - Pg 4 line 9 - I believe you mean "adverse wear related failure"

Questions

- In several places it was stated that "techniques were perfected by 2008" (Page 7 line 26; Page 10 line 13, etc.). As a reader, I would like a clearer statement from the authors as to how this technique was "perfected." Maybe softening "perfected" language, and stating how the comfort level and confidence in the techniques was obtained. Also, how was it determined to bifurcate Group 1 and Group 2 in 2008? Was July 1 used?

  - While there are definitive strengths to the study due to sample and longitudinal data, this study was in fact a retrospective design. Due to this, there are likely some limitations of internal validity, especially since this review covered a large timeframe. One could postulate that a surgeon's outcomes will undoubtedly improve due to normal maturation during a similar timeframe, for example.

  - Limitation of external validity should be stated due to the study including patient outcomes from one surgeon, limiting generalizability.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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