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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1) The title of the paper includes the phrase, “avoid progression of adolescent idiopathic scoliosis” Lantz’s study reveals 89% non-progression of AIS which could be interpreted as significant. However, the author states that this study showed an absolute ineffectiveness of the applied treatment, although it appears that all the inclusion criteria stated have been met. It is unclear as to why the author challenges this study as ineffective”.

2) Why does the author include Morningtar et al when this study includes adult subjects and the paper’s topic is adolescent idiopathic scoliosis?

Minor Compulsory Revisions:

1) “official medicine-”“traditional medicine

2) Under Results: confusing to this reader, only three papers were relevant to our study. Those two, however, did not satisfy all the required inclusion criteria. Do you mean, two of those?

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.