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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Chief-Editor,

We wish to thank the reviewers for the great help they gave to increase the quality and understandability of our paper. We carefully changed the paper according to the suggestions received. Here are the answer list together with the revised version of the paper where changes made have been clearly shown.

Reviewer 1 - HR Weiss

General
Three questions have been raised:
"no patients have been asked ...
This has been clarified throughout the paper, in the abstract, introduction and discussion.
"the children were not questioned at all"
This has been clarified throughout the paper, in the abstract, introduction and discussion.
"response rate"
This has been clarified in the discussion

Major compulsory revisions
1. Changed to clarify
2. Changed according to suggestions
3. Clarified in the abstract as well as in the introduction
4. Changed
5. Changed
6. Acknowledgment has been added
7. Yes, comprehensibility is used: the validation of a new questionnaire that does not relate to a pathology and in which there is no accepted "golden standard" comes form pre-test for comprehensibility and test-retest for repeatability. To evaluate the validity you need a golden standard, or you rely on comprehensibility. In this case Chi-square test is appropriate because of the variables involved.
8. We explained this point in methods as well as in discussion.
9. We did not choose the percentages proposed in the guidelines because at that time the guidelines were not done yet. We add the date of collection (methods) and we clarified why we chose these risks of progression in the discussion.
10. Tables have been changed and the questionnaire has been added in Appendix 1. We did not translate it because we don't want someone to think that this questionnaire has been produced in English. We accept any suggestion on this, but it would not be fare for readers to use it and compare to our results without a formal trans-cultural validation process, this is why we did not introduced it before in the paper, and why we strongly suggest to maintain it in Italian.

Minor essential revisions

Reviewer 2 - TB Grivas

Major compulsory revisions
Seven questions have been raised:
"response rate of affected children"
This has been clarified throughout the paper, in the abstract, introduction and discussion.
"answers of scoliotic and of non-scoliotic children parents"
This has been clarified throughout the paper, in the abstract, introduction and discussion.
"response rate"
This has been clarified in the discussion
"scale of 25% and 60% risk of progression"
We clarified why we chose these risks of progression in the discussion.
"rating scale easy ...
We explained this point in methods as well as in discussion.
"Chi-square test"
In this case Chi-square test is appropriate because of the variables involved.
"how many researchers"
Aknowledgment has been added
Reviewer 3 - JP O'Brien

General
Two questions have been raised:
"description of the methodology used to educate"
This has been clarified in the methods section as well as in discussion.
"clarification on why it was considered complex"
Clarified in the discussion sections.
Major compulsory revisions
All corrections have been made. Thank you.