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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors,

Thank you for your interesting literature review focusing on the problem of the choice of surgical approach concerning the hemiarthroplasty for femoral neck fracture.

Even if the level of evidence of the studies in this field is low, lateral approach seems to reduce the rate of hip dislocation in comparison with posterior approach.

The present conclusions confirm our initial supposition as concerns the surgical approach. In our institution, we opted for the anterior approach (HUETER approach) in order to reduce the rate of dislocation, to improve the postoperative functional recovery and to reduce the rate of SSI.

For my opinion, I think that posterior approach is an adapted surgical method for total hip replacement or total hip replacement needing femorotomy or femoral osteosynthesis.

Posterior approach is not adapted for hemiarthroplasty because we have to cut pellvitrochanteric muscles.

Lateral approach is also a unadapted approach because you cut a part of the gluteus medius which corresponds to the motor of the hip explaining the worse functional results than posterior approach highlighted in certain studies.

In this context, I think we should promote anterior approach as Hueter approach, Watson-Jones approach (with possibility to osteosynthesis the femoral shaft) or Rottinger approach. Anterior approach certainly reduces the rate of hip dislocation without impairing functional recovery because we spare the gluteus medius muscle.
Introduction part: no comment

Method part: no comment

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?

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.

Personally, I agree for a publication with minor revisions.

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.

No

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:

Acceptable
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