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Reviewer's report:

General comment:

This is an in vivo study of the osteointegration of Prestige LP prosthesis. Although this kind of study for Prestige LP prosthesis is lacking in the literature, similar studies using caprine model testing on other porous coated cervical disc replacement prostheses have been extensively published. The result would be more convincing if the study included other porous coated cervical disc replacement prostheses as the control.

Specific comments:

1. The title is vague and not specific. It would be better to rename as "In-vivo study of osteointegration in Prestige LP cervical disc prosthesis"

2. The number of subjects is too small. In other similar studies the number of study subjects were at least 12.

3. The follow-up period of 6 months is too short. At least 1 year result should be included.

4. Besides the histomorphometric assessment, other tests such as multi-directional flexibility testing can also reflect the stability and extent of the osteointegration. Please give more reason to support your choices of assessment method.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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