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**Reviewer's report:**

This article shows that the results of surgical treatment for the proximal femur are good in patients after standard or endoprosthesis replacement. The conclusions were accepted by orthopedic oncological surgeons now, but some questions should be answered.

1. In this paper, the authors used tumor resection method to treat 101 patients and in 21 patients metastatic tumors was not resected. so what is the indication of metastatic tumor resection and the cause of unresected?

2. As we know, the patients with proximal femur metastatic tumor underwent tumor resection and replacement with cemented proximal femur modular prosthesis (semi-hip replacement) and not total hip. From this paper, we can not know which prosthesis the authors used and what is the indication of the cemented or cementless prosthesis?

3. The authors should show us related radiographs of patients, including preoperative, postoperative, good follow-up result, postoperative revision, intramedullary nail broke and prosthesis loosen.

4. Radiotherapy is very important procedure to reduce postoperative recurrence, many reports documented that the effective dose should be over 40Gy. Why did the authors give their patients 8 Gy?

**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.

Unable to assess
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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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