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Cover letter

To reviewer 1(Dr Toru Maruyama):

1. First of all, I would like to thank you for your very useful comments concerning our submission. We have tried to incorporate all of your comments in our final version of the manuscript. Finally, we apologize because your previous comments seemed to be ignored.

2. I would like to inform you that in our final submission is included a latest paper with mid – term results about VEPTR technique:


3. Your first observation was about our mid or long term studies that included in our manuscript. We included this information at the results section and previously we had precisely defined the criteria about which studies fulfill them, at the methods section.

4. Your second observation about our manuscript was the requirement about detailed information for the studies included in our review referred on number, age, gender of the patients, type, location and magnitude of the deformity, type of the surgery, follow – up period, results and PFT or QOL and complications where available. For this reason we have gathered together all the studies creating a Table that includes all the above requirements. We think that this is very useful for the reader of our article. As a template we use the tables of your recent publication: “Effectiveness and outcomes of brace treatment: A systematic review” Moruyama et al, Physiotherapy Theory and Practice 2011, 27(1): 26 – 42.

5. We made the appropriate changes at the figure legends and hopefully we put them at the correct place of the text.

6. Finally, we have corrected the figure legends explaining them as much as the data of the original publication allow it. The 3rd, 4th and 5th image have been reproduced under the acceptance of the author Dr Hans Rudolf Weiss that he provided the images from his publication:

Unfortunately, there were not any further clinical or radiological information at this article.

7. The text has been proofread by a native British translator.

We would like once more to thank you for your useful recommendations and we hope that it would be of interest in its field.

Kind regards

Dr Angelos Kaspiris

To reviewer 2(Dr Elias Vasiliadis):

1. First of all, I would like to thank you for your very useful comments concerning our submission. We have tried to incorporate all of your comments in our final version of the manuscript.

2. I would like to inform you that in our final submission is included a latest paper with mid – term results about VEPTR technique:


3. At the 9th paragraph it was written that a block vertebra is a failure of formation is incorrect and it has been corrected to failure of segmentation.

4. The 14th paragraph of the background section has been change based on your recommendations.

5. At the 24th paragraph of background section the statement “As pointed out above” has been omitted because is not suitable with the section.

6. At the methods section we had precisely defined the inclusion and exclusion criteria of the selected studies and we analyze the studies that fulfill them.
7. Another observation about our manuscript was the requirement of detailed information for the studies included in our review referred on number, age, gender of the patients, type, location and magnitude of the deformity, type of the surgery, follow-up period, results and PFT or QOL, complications where available. For this reason we have gathered together all the studies creating a Table that includes all the above requirements.

8. Based on your recommendations, the expressions such as “more than 800”, or “over 1750”, or “around 40” have been corrected.

9. We have corrected the first paragraph of the discussion section mentioning that is referred mainly in Idiopathic Scoliosis.

10. Concerning the case series of the three patients that have been treated conservatively, more details about the type of the congenital scoliosis were included.

11. The conclusion of our paper has been changed based on your recommendations.

Finally, we would like to thank you for your assistance and your useful observations that help us to improve our submission.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Angelos Kaspiris