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Title: Evaluation of Implant Loosening Following Segmental Pedicle Screw Fixation in Adolescent Idiopathic Scoliosis: A 2 Year Follow-up with Low-Dose CT

Reviewer's report:
This revised manuscript includes corrections and recommended changes as in the previous reviews, though the issue of sensitivity and false positives still receives little attention. This is unfortunate, given the stated objective "to compare the rate of screw loosening detected by CT with that using plain radiography."

Major Compulsory Revisions:
In the cover letter, the authors state: "It is very well known that CT is more sensitive than plain radiography with regard to screw loosening... CT is almost a gold standard in this respect." They then focus on the lower x-ray dose aspect as the rationale for their recommendation to use CT. It would be helpful to incorporate the above statement into the body of the manuscript, with appropriate references to supporting literature. However, they should also note that ideally a 'gold standard' would be the most accurate, not necessarily the most sensitive method.

This has been done. Please see the highlighted text in the body of the manuscript. We have word count limit which we must take into consideration. Worth to notice that we have omitted statements regarding the higher sensitivity of CT is more sensitive compared to plain radiography. New references (ref no 10-13) on the accuracy of CT in the different aspects of the postoperative evaluation of pedicle screw fixation has been added.

Minor Compulsory Revisions
I checked, and Scoliosis (the journal) regularly employs the abbreviation 'et al.' with the period (full stop). So the present manuscript should do likewise.

Done
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