


 **Acknowledge editing support**


International publication guidelines such as [ICMJE guidelines](#) state that all non-author contributions, including editing, should be acknowledged.

If you are satisfied with the quality of editing, please acknowledge the editing contribution by adding the following line in the acknowledgements section:

We would like to thank Editage (www.editage.cn) for English language editing.

 Let us help you

- Respond to editor comments or send your questions to the editor
- Get your revisions checked before paper submission
- Let us know if you are not satisfied with the job

 Help us know you better

- Give feedback on the job
- Add the editor to your Favorite Editors list
- Let us know if your paper gets accepted by the journal

Scientific Editing Report

Dear Author,

This document contains an assessment of the manuscript in terms of its language and presentation, content, and submission readiness. Where relevant, I have also provided recommendations for improving the manuscript. Should you have any questions on the report, do let me know.

Best regards,
Shubhika Agarwal
Assistant Managing Editor
Center of Excellence for Medicine
Editage

Table of Contents

LANGUAGE AND PRESENTATION	3
Overview	3
Organization and flow	3
CONTENT REVIEW	5
Title, Abstract, and Keywords	5
Literature Review and Research Rationale	6
Study Design or Methodology	6
Results and Statistical Analyses	7
Discussion and Conclusion	7
SUBMISSION CHECKLIST	9

LANGUAGE AND PRESENTATION

Notes from the Language Editor

Overview

Overall, the language and grammar of the manuscript were fairly good. Grammatical corrections have been made throughout the manuscript, where required. Some recommendations for improving the manuscript structure have been made to align with the target journal's requirements and for better presentation of the content. Additional information is needed in some instances; these have been flagged using explanatory comments for your perusal.

Organization and flow

Abstract. The abstract needed some more details to meet the journal guidelines. Some headings and associated information were missing. I have made changes to address this issue and included comments to flag instances that would need your input. The concluding statement needed revision so that it does not simply repeat the results. The abstract should also discuss the implications of the study findings. I have included this information based on my understanding of the manuscript content.

Introduction. The introduction was well organized, overall. Previous studies on the press-fit and outcomes of total hip arthroplasty using the Anatomic Fiber Metal plus stem need to be discussed in more detail, so that what is known and unknown about the research topic is clearly presented. The language was good, barring some revisions that were made to improve sentence structure.

Methods. This section was not subdivided. I have included subdivisions and headings to improve the organization of the section.

Results. The results were sufficiently detailed and well described. However, I would suggest subdividing this section for ease of reading and correspondence with the methods.

Discussion and Conclusion. This section was well written. However, the journal requires the information in this section to be included in a particular order. Please see my detailed comment in the manuscript describing this.

Formatting

The manuscript has been formatted for the BMJ. At present, title page information and references need to be added. Information needs to be added to the abstract to meet the journal's requirements with respect to structure and word count (detailed instructions are provided in the manuscript). A transparency statement, funding statement, and a patient and public involvement statement are required. Moreover, the Discussion needs to be structured as per the journal guidelines. Summary boxes stating "What is already known on this topic" and "What this study adds" need to be included as well.

CONTENT REVIEW

Notes from the Scientific Reviewer

Title, Abstract, and Keywords

The title could better describe the findings of the research and the study design.

The abstract is currently quite short and below the minimum limit of 250 words. As per journal guidelines, abstracts should be 250-300 words. It also does not sufficiently highlight the study design and setting.

Keywords were not provided. Please confirm with the journal whether these are required. Some suggestions: Total hip arthroplasty; Cementless stem; Metaphyseal fit.

Recommendation 1. The BMJ requires that a subtitle including the study design be included. Please add this to the title page.

Recommendation 2. Please add information on the Design, Setting, and Interventions, as required by the journal. The conclusion in the abstract is simply a statement of the main result. I have made some recommendations in this regard in the manuscript.

Recommendation 3. As per journal guidelines, the results of statistical analyses (depending on the study design) need to be included in the results. Some numerical data to support the statement on differences in *stem fixation and bone reaction are required*.

Literature Review and Research Rationale

The introduction (including the literature review) is somewhat short. Whilst BMJ suggests a succinct introduction, they recommend three paragraphs. This section would benefit from expansion. Suggestions are provided below.

Recommendation 1. It is mentioned that the outcomes of THA with the studied stem are reported to be good in Caucasian patients. Although the authors state that the outcomes may not be the same in Japanese patients, the rationale behind this is not indicated. Are there physiological differences that would lead you to expect a difference? Are the types of osteoarthritis that require THA different in Caucasian patients? Please elaborate on the reasoning for carrying out the study.

Recommendation 2. It is stated that the stem investigated in the study was designed to achieve stable fixation by metaphyseal fit. The introduction would benefit from a brief discussion of the limitations of other stems – for example, is it difficult to achieve stable fixation using other stems? Is the Anatomic Fiber Metal plus stem considered superior to other stems?

Study Design or Methodology

As the study was addressing a very specific question in a defined population, the study design was appropriate. It may be informative to state the study design (I would suggest that this is a longitudinal study).

Recommendation 1. Please clearly describe the study design (e.g., retrospective, single-center, case-series), so the reader does not have to guess. Please make sure that patient numbers in the different groups add up.

Recommendation 2. The numbers mentioned in this section do not add up clearly and the process of exclusion with the number of hips

remaining at each stage is unclear. Please refer to the individual comments in the manuscript for further information.

Results and Statistical Analyses

The results are sufficiently detailed. Although statistical analyses are described in the Methodology, no p values are included in the results. The journal requires that exact levels of statistical significance are included. Please add these data.

Recommendation 1. Although the study describes the statistical approaches used to determine significance, there is no indication of how significant the sample size was. It would strengthen the impact of the study to calculate the minimum significant sample size to confirm that your sample size meets this. Moreover, the journal requires the use of certain terms to describe statistical results based on the study design. Please check the detailed comment in the manuscript regarding this.

Recommendation 2. There are significant omissions in the Results section, where you describe the JOA and CFR values. Please add the JOA scores before surgery and at the follow up, the mean CFR value, and the p values to the manuscript.

Discussion and Conclusion

The Discussion has good flow and is written in a comprehensive manner. Limitations are appropriately discussed. However, the journal requires the Discussion to be structured in a particular manner. This means that this section will have to be restructured and missing information added.

Moreover, one area which could benefit from further discussion is the other implications of poor metaphyseal fit. Although you report that this does not affect the stability at follow-up, are there other possible effects of poor fit?

The conclusions section is very succinct and simply summarizes the findings of the study. This requires elaboration, to discuss the meaning of the results, significance, implications, and possible future research indicated by the present study.

Recommendation 1. As per journal guidelines, please structure your Discussion according to

- Statement of principal findings
- Strengths and weaknesses of the study
- Strengths and weaknesses in relation to other studies, discussing important differences in results
- Meaning of the study: possible explanations and implications for clinicians and policymakers
- Unanswered questions and future research

Recommendation 2. In the first paragraph of the Discussion you state that "...this fit of stem is good for 8 to 12 years after surgery..."; however, it is unclear why you mention this time period. The range of times for follow-up of your study was 5-16 years. Please explain how you derived the time period.

Recommendation 3. The conclusion section should be used to discuss the implications of the present research to the scientific community, and possibly the economic and social implications of the research. The current conclusion is very succinct and simply summarizes the findings of the paper. Please add further discussion of the implications of your results. Future avenues of research that your study presents should be discussed in the conclusions. Please discuss the directions for future research on this topic.

SUBMISSION CHECKLIST

Journal Scope

Section	Assessment	Comments
The paper can be submitted to the target journal	Yes	The manuscript satisfies the BMJ's criteria for an original research article, providing information that can improve decision-making in the medical field.
The study conforms to relevant ethical standards	Yes	A statement is included confirming that the study was approved by the ethics committee of the author's institute and conforms to the standards of the Declaration of Helsinki. However, further information would be useful to provide the approval number and clarify whether informed written consent was obtained.

Journal Requirements

Section	Assessment	Comments
The title page contains the title and all author information, including the complete contact details of the corresponding author.	No	The title page was absent. Please ensure that a title page is added including the relevant information: for each author his or her name, affiliation (job title) at the time the paper was written, email and, for the corresponding author, the contact address.
The paper is in the format preferred by the journal (MS Word, PDF, TeX).	Yes	The document is in MS Word.
All figures and tables have been prepared in the	NA	Figures and tables were not included.

correct format and in keeping with the journal's requirements.

In-text citations and references correspond to each other and are accurate.	Yes/NA	In-text citations were appropriately presented in Vancouver style. The reference list was not included. Please be sure to include a reference list in Vancouver style.
Citations have been provided where necessary.	Yes	In-text citations have been provided appropriately in most instances, except one instance where a citation needs to be included in the Introduction. I have flagged this for you.
A cover letter has been included with the manuscript.	Yes	A cover letter has been prepared for the manuscript.