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**Reviewer’s report:**

I had the opportunity to re-review the manuscript entitled 'Biomechanical comparison of different combinations of hook and screw in one spine motion unit-an experiment in porcine model'.

First, I want to thank the authors for answering points made in the prior review sufficiently. In general the paper is well written and these findings might be an important contribution to the literature, however; there are some issues.

The question posed by the authors is well defined and the methods are clearly described. The discussion section is well balanced. The limitations are well discussed.

**Minor Essential Revisions:**

1) The word pullout is used as both ‘pull-out’ and ‘pullout’ throughout the manuscript. I believe that the authors should stick to only one spelling.

2) In the last sentence of the methods ‘the trademark’ sign is not displayed correctly probably due to ‘encoding’ issues.

3) In the conclusion section the word ‘thora-columbar’ should be changed to ‘thoraco-lumbar’.

**Discretionary Revisions:**

1) Although improvements are made, I still believe that the results section might be given in more detail.

2) In the background section, in the first paragraph, authors state that the bone quality of the lamina is better than that of the vertebral body in the osteoporotic bone, but do not discuss this concept in the discussion.

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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