

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/aoj-23-32>

Review Comments

Reviewer A

Comment 1: I think this is a well-done review and the pooled data is very nice to have regarding subsidence rates, failure rates, survivorship etc. My only concern is that you have excluded 25 potential studies due to lack of access to the full text of the article.... That is a huge number. Need to explain why you would cut the numbers available to reviewed from potentially 36 studies to just 11. I think if it's just a pay to review issue that is not a great reason to eliminate a potentially well done study. Should find a way through institutional access etc to get all the possible appropriate studies for a meta-analysis.

Additionally just grammatical and english errors throughout that would need to be cleaned up or proofed. Simple things like correcting to subsidence greater than 5mm instead of superior to 5mm would make reading and comprehending the paper easier for the reader.

Reply 1: 25 papers were excluded due to the lack of access to the full text because they were articles without DOI, papers of supplements of which only the abstract was available, or articles written only partially in English, or papers without working download link. All the articles included in the meta-analysis were collected respecting the inclusion criteria, even if they were non-open access papers. We corrected grammatical errors.

Reviewer B

Comment 2: Interesting Topic. Thorough methodology. I would urge the authors to explore monobloc stem efficacy and incorporate that in their paper in order to see if there is an appreciable difference in fluted stem efficacy and monobloc efficacy. It appears that the discussion and primary measured outcome only focus on fluted modular stems, but a single section comparing the efficacy of these prosthesis to monoblocs will help contextualize your findings.

The paper would benefit from the revision of certain phrasing which impact clarity and flow. In Line 100-102, the inclusion criteria can be reformatted to mimic the exclusion criteria (eg:

phrases or terms utilized such as modular flute, monobloc) rather than remain a full sentence that is partially vague. The methods section is otherwise well done and covers major aspects. There are certain phrases that are uncommon such as Excel Microsoft rather than Microsoft Excel, and the flow may benefit from revising this. There is a grammatical error in line 169 (non-English paper vs non-English papers). There is a grammatical error in line 179 (we exclude vs we excluded). The first paragraph of the discussion could be better organized and would benefit from slight revision. This in specific is a very minor point of concern. However, the second paragraph of the discussion will benefit from more substantial revision. The evidence could be presented in a more succinct manner.

Reply 2: Limits and efficacy of modular and monobloc femoral stems are reported in the introduction paragraph (line 53-57) and are also reiterated in the discussion (line 195-201). The topic of the paper concern mainly on modular fluted revision stems and so this is why we did not spend too much space on monobloc stems. We corrected the inclusion/exclusion criteria as requested. We corrected the grammatical mistakes (line 169 and 179). We modified the first and the second paragraph of the discussion as requested.