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Reviewer’s report:

Significant improvement has been made to the manuscript. It is clear that the authors invested significant effort into developing the revised version.

I would like to make the following suggestions for additional minor essential revisions.

1. In my statement in the methods section of my previous review “Clear description of the criteria the authors are using to determine dysfunction needs to be made,” I was interested in having the authors establish the need for assessing participants for degenerative disc disease. Assessment of the cervical spine for degenerative disease is made in the methods section, and in the discussion section the value of this data is called into question (at least as it correlates to pain). Essentially, please clarify why radiographic examination is needed in this study. This may be as simple as rewording the hypothesis in Lines 100-102 of the revised manuscript to indicate “increased incidence of degenerative disc disease and pain severity” as opposed to “repercussions.” I apologize for any confusion.

2. Consider consistently using the phrase "cervical pain symptoms" where appropriate throughout the document.

3. I believe that the discussion of treatment methods for AC dislocations and associated outcomes should be omitted from the background section of the paper, as the introduction section of a paper is generally used to provide rationale, context and motivation, and overall need/purpose of the study. The authors have expressed their perception of its importance in the document; therefore, consideration should be given to including it in the discussion section of the manuscript.

4. Line 74-76 - rewording is necessary to clarify for the reader that the distal clavicle is 100% displaced above the acromion with 25% to 100% increase in the coracoclavicular interspace.

5. Line 191 - consider rewording "paper recognizing the fact" to "investigating the possibility"

6. Lines 237-238 - In this section, are the authors stating the cervical lordosis is causing the patients’ discomfort, or that muscle dysfunction is causing discomfort
and contributing to the cervical hypolordosis? Consider rewording for clarification. A similar situation is noted in Line 263.

7. Lines 257-259 - consider relocating this text to the "Conclusions" section of the manuscript. This section may also need to be reworded for clarity.

8. Consider adding a statement in the conclusions section regarding any need for further studies identified by this investigation/manuscript.

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in evaluating this manuscript. I hope my comments have been of assistance to the authors in their developing this manuscript.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests