Reviewer Comments – Manuscript 31500

Reviewer 01200726:

1- Could the authors emphasize the difference of the outcome between cementless and cemented total hip arthroplasty? It would be better to add a table concerning complications.

Response: Thank you. Table 2 has been added which compares the complications in both groups.

Reviewer 00054174:

1- Page 3, line 49: "…resorption with subsequent…" it will be better if "with" can be revised to "and".

Response: Done

2- Page 3, line 56: "It is thought to results from…." "results" should be "result".

Response: Done

3- Page 5, line 101-106: Is this systematic review accordance with PRISMA statement? Presenting keywords only seems to be insufficient. Can you kindly give your search strategy in more detail?

Response: Yes it is. We have updated the paragraph as requested.

4- Did you contact original author(s) to obtain more information? Please clarify.

Response: No we did not as this was not required. A comment has been added as requested.

5- Page 5, line 108-111: According to Cochrane Handbook for systematic review, eligibility criteria should be present in the form of PICOS. Please modify.

Response: Done

6- Page 5, line 113-117: As for Data extraction, only first extracted data. It seems to be questionable.

Response: the second author has now been involved. A comment has been added to the text.

7- Page 6, line 130-133: why are there results for quality assessment? I did not find any description for quality assessment in Method, and what's tool you employed? Please add some contents regarding quality assessment in Method.

Response: This has been removed

8- Page 16, Figure 1: Can you briefly describe the reasons for exclusion in Flow chart? As this study is a systematic review, why "studies included in quantitative synthesis (n=8)"? Please clarify.

Response: We have modified the flowchart as requested

9- In addition, can you describe some limitations of this systematic review in Discussion?

Response: a paragraph on the limitations has been added at the end of the discussion as requested.

Reviewer 02444729:

Nice study with accurate selection/exclusion chart, sound statistics and clear cut results.

Response: Thank you for reviewing our work.