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Dear Editors,

Enclosed is our revised manuscript. We have addressed all of the comments returned to us in the reviews of our paper. A detailed list of all individual changes is included below.

All of the listed authors have read the revisions and agree with their conclusions.

Sincerely,

Elisabetta D’Agata

**Detailed list of manuscript revisions:**

Response to specific comments raised by Reviewer 1 (Tomas Kotwicki) on 30th December, 2009

1. We have realized the linguistic difficulties present in the text, so we have given more attention to the use of tenses. We have used the *past tense* to explain the research and its results (in Methods, Results and Discussions), maintaining the present verbs only in the Background Section, in Conclusions or in places where we have referred to the literature.

2. We have changed the name of the Questionnaire translated to clarify which one we have studied, calling it BSSQ (brace).es

3. We are grateful to the reviewer who noted the incorrect use of SRS-22 to assess the criterion validity; in fact, the two questionnaires BSSQ (brace).es and SRS-22 measured two different concepts: Stress caused by brace and Quality of life related to Health. However, as the two concepts are linked, especially since stress is part of the multidimensional concept of Quality of Life, we expected higher quality of life values to be correlated to lower stress
scores. So we have changed the concept of criterion validity into convergent validity, referring to the degree to which the two concepts that should be related theoretically are interrelated in reality. So we have changed the Results in Abstract Section and Methods Section, replacing “criterion validity” with “convergent validity”.

4. We have restructured Methods section and Results section, introducing and describing the statistical analysis performed in Methods section. We have tried to keep the two sections parallel.

5.6.7.8. We have tried to be more rigorous in Background section, transforming it completely and considering only the topic of Stress. At the end of the section, we have maintained the part on Protective Factors for treatment outcomes because they could be considered in opposition to Stress.

9. We have changed the expression “researchers agree” with “researchers reveal”, as you suggested.

10 We have checked the abbreviations and their explications.

11. We have eliminated the imprecise term of “scientific community”, referring directly to the names of the authors.

12. We have added the information about wearing a brace at school in Methods. There were 14 patients who wore a brace in part-time modality at school. During the rest of the day, they played sports or did other social activities without wearing a brace.

13. About compliance, patients claimed to have followed Dr. Rigo’s indications. This data could not be checked and we had to trust what patients said.

14. We have corrected the reference to the original German questionnaire

15. We have been more careful with the abbreviations and their explications.

16. We are really thankful to you for having stressed the difference between the two concepts of “Stress” and “Quality of life”. We have realized the confusion given that these concepts are so linked, but as you point out, they are however different concepts.
So we have changed Abstract’s Background, Background, Methods and Results in the article and we have explained the relation, looking for literature references.

18. We have rectified our affirmation, choosing Shapiro-Wilk test which is currently considered more powerful than the Kolmogorov - Smirnov one. We have modified the significance of this general statement (“test verifies normal distribution”) by introducing “in our sample” and using the past tense.

19. We have put right: “Cronbach”.

20. We have explained the use of SRS-22 to check the validity and we have rewritten the sentence.

21. We have explained the Principal Component Analysis, introducing its meaning and the tests used in Methods Section. We have linked the results found with the literature in Background Section, explaining the bipolar factors with the theory of the cognitive evaluation and referring to the use of coping strategies.

Table 1. We have substituted this table with others, but we have rounded the values to one decimal place, have checked the “strange terms” and corrected them. We have eliminated the use of colors, as it did not identify any differences.

Table 2,3,4 (now tables 5, 6, 7). We have improved the table explications and the term of Eigenvalues has been explicated in Methods Section.

Table 5 (now table 1). We have changed the title and rounded the values to two decimal places. We have substituted the Spanish “con corsé” with Brace.

Response to specific comments raised by Reviewer 2 (Stefano Negrini) on 9th January, 2010

1. As indicated, we have transposed the first section of Results in the Methods Section since it was the description of the sample.

2. We have restructured Method Section, reporting the statistical description of the tests used and its functions at the end of the Section.
3. We have re-written Results Section in a discursive way, inserting numbers and statistical significance; we have reported tests if they were associated to the final results.

4. We have introduced the explications about tests used and their functions in the Methods Section, considering the point of views of the average readers of the journal.

5. We are planning a research to identify all the Components present in the Stress construct, but at the moment we can only make some conjectures about Family relationship or Social support. So we have reported this point in Discussions, as you suggested. Instead of putting it in Abstract Section since there is no evidence at the moment, we have mentioned it in Conclusions. The advantage of the Greek Questionnaire is that it studies Quality of life of adolescents instead of Stress, so it is based on SRS-22 studies.

6. We have reconsidered the comparison with SRS-22 as you suggested. So we compare BSSQ (brace).es with each subscales of SRS-22, studying and commenting the correlations.

Response to specific comments raised by Reviewer 3 (Juan Bago) on 20\textsuperscript{th} January, 2010

1. We have calculated floor and ceiling effect, introducing new tables (Table 2 and 3).

2. We have introduced descriptive data of SRS-22 and the correlation matrix of BSSQ (brace).es and SRS-22 subscales.

Your advice on studying more in-depth SRS-22 has been really useful, as it led to discovering high relations between BSSQ (brace).es and the two SRS-22 subscales of Body Image and Mental Health. We have not found an important correlation with the satisfaction subscale. We have introduced a new table (Table 5).