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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

Please add Cobb angle before surgery, after surgery, and correction rate to the Table 1. It will reveal some points. In case 1, nearly 80% correction was obtained with hybrid construct. While with all screw construct, the procedure took more time with more blood loss and less correction rate. I do not think these results support their conclusion that modern instrumentation technique using only pedicle screws is superior to the hybrid techniques. Thus, the conclusion should be changed in accordance with their results.

Case 4: No rod lengthening procedure performed during the 18 month period between the initial surgery and the final fusion? In consequence, spontaneous fusion occurred in this duration would reduce the correction obtained in the final fusion surgery. This is not the proper use of the growing rod technique.

Page 13, line 14: Surgical revision was performed in 2 cases on account of the mobilization of instrumentation. – Correct?

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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.
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