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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript has improved in readability and scientific content after the authors revision. In my first review I focused on the major compulsory issues. Now we come to the minor essential points.

- Still, the manuscript needs a review regarding the flow of the language.
- The abbreviations 2D, 3D and AP should be presented in full text the first time they are used.
- In the result section, alpha and p value are used with irregularity.
- In the text, X-ray or x-ray, capital letter or not?
- In the discussion, the first half of the second paragraph "Our study showed... until; ...digital image acquisition and processing." makes the reader confused. It is to difficult to follow, please simplify. Other parts of the discussion is better.
- The last paragraph before the conclusion; Take out Hertel because if his 5 basic questions are not explained, it does not add any to this manuscript.
- Conclusion; the first sentence is unnecessary and unscientific. Settle with the 2 last sentences and stay focused on the message of your report.
- The "baseline" of fig 1 could be conventional x-ray, 2 D and 3 D instead of 1,2 and 3, respectively. That would simplify the legend to the figure and enhance the understanding. The same regarding fig 3.
- Legend to fig 4; Assessment of relevant structures of the proximal humerus according to Neer (2-part...) . This is easier to understand.