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Author’s response to reviews:

RE: BSUR-D-18-00425

Comparing two common surgical approaches to the hip for hemiarthroplasty. A scoping review
James Fullam; Paraskevas G Theodosi; John Charity; Victoria Goodwin BMC Surgery

17/12/2018

Dear Mr O’Cueller,

We thank the reviewers for their comments. Please see below specific responses to each of the points raised by the reviewers.

Mariano Fernández-Fairén, MD, PhD (Reviewer 2):

1.- There is an error in line 63: bibliographic references 3-5 included reference 4 that it is not from a register report. Perhaps it must be 3,5,6, or only 3,5?
AUTHORS: The reviewer is correct, the references should only refer to bibliographic references 3 and 5, the manuscript has been amended.

2.- The Table 1 is incomplete. The explanation of the signs used in it is missing. The manuscript has been amended with a legend that explains the signs used. Page 17 lines 413 to 515

3.- Being the scope of this study to determine the existing evidence in this issue, why have you not assessed the quality of the included studies? It would undoubtedly have been of interest and help to support the evidence provided by these studies in one or the other direction.

We agree that the assessment of quality of articles is important, however it is considered outside the scope of a scoping review. The authors believe that as multiple study types (including multiple types of observational design (cross sectional, retrospective and prospective cohort designs) and a randomised controlled study) were included in this review, any form of rigorous quality assessment would have involved the use of a number of different quality assessment criteria. This would have significantly lengthened the article, been difficult for readers to interpret, and as only one RCT was included in the review it is unlikely that such assessment would have had significant bearing on the findings. Had significant numbers of potentially high quality studies been retrieved, a full systematic review(s), specific to study types, would have been an appropriate subsequent research priority.

Arnaud Dubory (Reviewer 3): Dear authors,

Introduction part: no comment

AUTHORS: No comments

Method part: no comment

AUTHORS: No comments
Result part: Can you give us the rate of surgical-site infection and the impact of the type of surgical approach on this postoperative adverse event?

AUTHORS: Only 6 studies reported an outcome related to surgical site infection and only one found approach associated with a significant difference in infection rate. An addition at Page 8 line 175 now summarises this.

Discussion part: the authors well establish the lack of evidence on this field. The authors should precise that DLA seems to give better overall outcomes than posterior approach.

AUTHORS: On this point the authors agree that the DLA does appear to give a better outcome in terms of dislocation and this is acknowledged on Page 11 Lines 240 – 241, however we believe there is insufficient evidence to support a statement concerning all outcomes in this review.

Arjun Ballal, MBBS, MS (Reviewer 1):

1) The abstract is the face of any article and has to be properly written.

AUTHORS: The authors have endeavoured to write a suitable and properly written abstract, this comment does not provided any specific guidance with regard to how the abstract can be improved.

2) The conclusion does not explain as to which method is superior to the other.

AUTHORS: The evidence does not clearly support one method as superior, this is the primary finding of the review.

3) Kindly, avoid mentioning keywords from the title.

AUTHORS: The word hemiarthroplasty has been removed from the key words.

4) Kindly, rename 'background' as 'introduction' in the case file.

AUTHORS: BMC surgery guidelines indicate the use of the heading Background
5) 'Aims and objectives' to be mentioned in the abstract.

AUTHORS: The abstract has been amended to include the aim of the study.

6) References to mentioned at several places in the introduction.

AUTHORS: The comment of the reviewer is unclear.

7) The introduction is unnecessarily long and needs to be made to only what is relevant. Unnecessary points to be excluded.

AUTHORS: This comment lacks sufficient detail to guide the authors.

8) 'Aims and objectives' have to be mentioned in the case file.

AUTHORS: The aims of the study are set out on Page 5 lines 96 - 102.

9) The introduction the flow of data needs to be continuous and understandable.

AUTHORS: This comment lacks sufficient detail to guide the authors.

10) The materials and methods can be better presented.

AUTHORS: This comment lacks sufficient detail to guide the authors.

11) Images can be added to improve and support the study at hand.

AUTHORS: The authors do not believe images are needed to support this study. Description and reference to the original description of technique are proved for the surgical approaches that are investigated.

12) Graphs and line diagrams can be added to improve the presentation of the results.

AUTHORS: The data extracted from the included articles is not suitable for presentation in graphs or lines due to the heterogeneity of study types.
13) The discussion is unnecessarily long and unnecessary points need to be avoided only relevant points need to be mentioned.

AUTHORS: This comment lacks sufficient detail to guide the authors.

14) The conclusion is the final inference from the study at hand and has to be summarised in one or two lines.

AUTHORS: The authors are not aware of submission guideline that indicates conclusions must be limited to one or two lines. We have provided our conclusions in a single paragraph and believe they are concise and convey our findings and suggestions for future work.

15) All the references need to be mentioned in Vancouver format and have to be not over 18 years old; if so have to be updated.

AUTHORS:

We have used the referencing format recommended in the journal submission guidelines (see also point below).

With regard to the need for articles not to be over 18 years old we are unclear why this would be the case. We have provided a justification for excluding articles published prior to 1980 (Page 6 Line 141) but articles published after this year were eligible for inclusion.

16) Avoid the term 'et al' in the references and the names of all the authors need to be mentioned.

AUTHORS: The authors disagree with this point.

For the Vancouver style of referencing, standard practice for in-text referencing where it is necessary to use the author’s name (and there are more than one author) is the use of ‘et al.’ and the citation number.

We have amended all instances where et al. is used, to have the citation number follow directly rather than at the end of the sentence.

Kind regards

James Fullam