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Reviewer's report:

Authors have evaluated two different instruments in skip level cervical disc disease's surgical treatment.

1. I could not understand what is meant by "zero profile" in this article. If this is stating the absence of an anterior plate, this is a misleading way to describe that cage in my opinion.
2. Clinical scores being similar between those two groups is not a surprise so the main consideration in this study is fusion rate and adjacent segment degeneration. According to the results, fusion rates are also similar, however, there is a significant difference between adjacent segment disease. First I think that low number of patients in both groups may be misleading regarding statistical results.

Second, I should admit I could not understand why the authors opt for anterior plates. Authors say "The presence of anterior plates is regarded as a predisposing factor of adjacent segment degeneration[22]. Park et al. [11]found that an anterior cervical plate close to the adjacent intervertebral disc may cause adjacent level disc degeneration or surrounding bone formation". So why did you use them?

Necessity of an anterior plate is the major question here. A simple, neither zero profile nor plated, cage would be enough in my opinion. Two levels cervical discectomy and presence of a healthy segment in-between does not need additional stabilization. This should be stated and discussed in the paper.
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