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Author's response to reviews: see over
General: We have made major changes to the manuscript, in response to reviewers’ suggestions, and appreciate the improvements to quality and clarity. These more clarification of terms and definitions; and inclusion of additional references relevant to pathology with special respect to latest research.

Prof. Martha Hawes 2006 (I’m very thankful for that as well) took the task to establish an updated 2006 version according to the reviewers comments and with respect to latest knowledge to be published in a paper we are ready to accept for SCOLIOSIS as well:

MS: 1576481817885651
The Transformation of Spinal Curvature into Spinal Deformity: Pathological Processes and Implications for Treatment
Martha C Hawes and Joseph P O'Brien
Scoliosis

Before I have resubmitted the paper I’ve asked the coauthors to agree with the changes made. It has to be recognized that PT will have to start earlier and the brace indication is about the same.

Responses to specific queries, concerns and suggestions are detailed below.

Marian Wade: We appreciate the feedback and constructive criticism, which we have addressed and which to the greatest part was corrected by the reviewer herself (My very special thanks for that!).

I myself had to clarify the questions arising from the figure and with respect to Lonstein and Carlson’s calculation:

1. In Figure 1, the formula as stated is ambiguous, as it was in the original Lonstein and Carlson article. To be clear, parentheses are needed around the "3 x Risser sign" value, to differentiate it from the possible misinterpretation of subtracting the number 3 from the Cobb angle first, before multiplying that value by the Risser sign.
   Done!
2. Figure 1, complete with number of cases that each data point is based on, requires a reference to the original Lonstein and Carlson article if it is to be used. There is also no note of the small number of cases on which the upper margins of the graph are based.
   Pointed out in the figure legend!
3. The authors do not mention Lonstein and Carlson's specification that the progression estimation formula was found to work only for curves between 20 and 29 degrees.
   Pointed out in the figure legend!
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