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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Reviewers

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers’ comments concerning our manuscript entitled “Unipedicular versus bipedicular percutaneous vertebroplasty for osteoporotic vertebral compression fractures: a prospective randomized study” (ID: 1952320904152143). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval. Revised portion are marked in red in the paper. The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the reviewer’s comments are as flowing:
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Author’s response to reviews

Reviewer #1:
1. Response to comment: (Tables with lot of data are not easy for reading. We suggest the author can convert the table 2 and 3 into picture)
Response: We change the convert the table 2 and 3 into pictures.

2. Response to comment: (Line 196-199 need language modification)
Response: We have invited one native English speaker go through our paper and correct the multiple spelling and Grammar mistakes.

3. Response to comment: (Line 180. exposure times should be exposure time)
Response: We change the expression exposure times to exposure time in Line 180.

4. Response to comment: (Line 211. There were no differences should be There was no significant difference)
Response: We change the expression “There were no differences” to “There was no significant difference” in Line 211.

5. Response to comment: (Needs some language corrections before being published)
Response: We have invited one native English speaker go through our paper and correct the multiple
Reviewer #2:
1. Response to comment: (Needs some language corrections before being published)
Response: We have invited one native English speaker go through our paper and correct the multiple spelling and Grammar mistakes.
Special thanks to you for your good comments.

Editorial Requirements:
1. Response to comment: (Please ensure that these sections are present and clearly labelled as described above)
Response: I am sure this manuscript follows the correct structure for the research article.

2. Response to comment: (Please remove Competing Interest and funding in the Title page. Please move it after Conclusion section)
Response: We remove Competing Interest and funding in the Title page and move it after Conclusion section

3. Response to comment: (Please reformat your Acknowledgement section please note that by way of a section ?Acknowledgements)
Response: We reformat the Acknowledgement section by way of a section. We add the Acknowledgement section as follows: The authors would like to thank Pro Yongxiang Wang and Dr Jun Cai for the technical support and the proof-reading of the original manuscript. The authors wish to thank to Jijun Huang and Zhiqiang Zhang for the translation assistance and to all participants in our study.

4. Response to comment: (Consent statement: Please state in the Methods section whether written informed consent for participation in the study was obtained from participants or, where participants are children, a parent or guardian.)
Response: We have already stated the Institutional Review Board of our hospital (Clinical Hospital of Yangzhou University Institutional Review Board Committee) approved this study and the written informed consent for participation in the study was obtained from participants in the Methods section.

We tried our best to improve the manuscript and made some changes in the manuscript. These changes will not influence the content and framework of the paper. And here we did not list the changes but marked in red in revised paper.

We appreciate for Editors/Reviewers’ warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval.

Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.
Yours sincerely,

Liang Zhang