

## **ANSWERS TO REVIEW**

### **REVIEW n °1**

This is an interesting manuscript dealing with a popular field of revision hip arthroplasty. The authors presented their results of a tantalum acetabular implant in 58 patients requiring revision surgery, which is a significant advantage of the study. They were able to show non-inferior results even in big bone defects of the acetabular rim. Data is presented in a statistically comprehensive way. Also limitations are carefully addressed. However, two points have to be made prior to considering the manuscript for publication: 1. Several language deficiencies are obvious throughout the manuscript - I have outlined some of them in the manuscript-review attached. An English speaker should go through the paper! 2. Radiographs of successful surgical cases should be included - at least one major bone defect before and after revision. Also a difference between a radiolucent line and gap could be made more comprehensive by including x-rays.

#1

Thank you very much for the suggestion.

I handed the manuscript to an authorized translator to correct language deficiencies and I have attached the language editing certificate

#2

Thank you very much for the suggestion.

I have included some revision cases (a minor revision, a major revision, and a failure) I also inserted an image of a radiolucent line and a gap to clarify the difference

### **REVIEW n °2**

this article has the 5-10 years follow-up, but it hasn't any figures, let the author provide the figures about the follow-up.

#1

Thank you very much for the suggestion.

I have included images in the work, as also required by another reviewer, exactly a minor revision, a major revision, and a failure.

## **REVISIONS OF MANUSCRIPT**

I have inserted:

1. open-access
2. structured abstract
3. key words
4. copyright
5. core tip
6. audio core tip
7. Figure 1
8. Figure 2
9. Figure 3
10. Figure 4
11. Figure 5
12. comments