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Author's response to reviews: see over
Cover letter giving a point-by-point response to the concerns.

Referee no. 3 Toru Maruyama

1. The sentence you suggested has been added to case no. 4.
2. Through an oversight of ours, the wrong postop. Angle had been reported. Now, it has been replaced with the postop. Cobb angle after final fusion.

Referee no. 4 Lawrence Lenke

1. Abstract, Methods, last sentence: correction has been made.
2. Results, line 4: correction has been made.
3. Results, line 9: yes, we meant rod and correction has been made.
4. Abstract, Conclusions: they have been revised following your suggestions. Special emphasis had been put on specific aspects, although not examined in this paper, because the growth-related problems of these patients are being thoroughly studied by the authors from the genetic point of view. In addition, another patient underwent surgery at the same authors’ division and was instrumented using the growing rod; the lengthening procedure was performed twice but this patient was not included in the case series because the follow-up was not long enough when the paper was first drafted.
5. Page 5, Methods: regarding the two patients without karyotype confirmation (cases no. 1 and no. 3), the authors based their diagnosis of PWS on the clinical findings which were consistent with those described by Holm and Cassidy (Prader-Willi syndrome: consensus diagnostic criteria). The two patients fully complied with the diagnostic criteria developed by these authors.
6. Page 8, line 5: the sentence has been corrected
7. Page 8, line 8: regressed has been replaced with resolved.
8. End of the first paragraph: no consensus to proceed was obtained from the patient’s parents.
9. Page 11, bottom: we meant loosenins as suggested by referee no. 5. Arthrodesis was extended to L5 to provide more stability to this patient, the boy being overweight and with porotic bones.

Referee no. 5 Oheneba Boachie-Adjei

1. Revisions have been performed following your instructions and are highlighted in the text.
2. Grades, assessed using Asia impairment scale, were added to case no. 2.
3. Regarding SRS instrument outcomes, they are not available.