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Reviewer’s report:

The author’s have responded to prior suggested modifications and the manuscript is improved. A few non-essential discretionary suggestions for improvement are provided below. There is no need for re-review.

Computer-assisted methods for measuring intervertebral motion are used in most large clinical trials, and the observer agreement for these method have been reported in multiple papers. For this reason, the first sentence of the last paragraph of the introduction could be rewritten to: “The intra- and inter-observer variability of various clinical methods for measuring cervical sagittal plane rotation has not been previously compared.”

The author’s could report the percent of assessed levels that were classified as unstable by consensus (at least 2 observer’s agreed) of observers to help understand the statistics. If there were very few levels classified as unstable, the statistics are not as reliable.

It would also help to include, perhaps just for method 2, the probability that observers would agree to within 0.5 deg. Alternatively, they could calculate the average for all three observers (for method 2), and then report the average and std dev for the absolute difference between each observers measurement and the average of all three observers. That would help readers appreciate how much variability can be expected between observers.

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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