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Reviewer’s report:

Congratulations to the interesting case. I have only minor suggestions for improvement:

Discussion: Lee reported a similar patient, who however was ambulatory. In my view, this is a big difference to your patient! Maybe the operation is more beneficial in wheelchair patients. This is an issue to discuss.

The passage "They thought the excessive extend of back muscles maintained upright posture and gave chance to stand and walk. Thus, the corrective for hyperlordosis wasn't recommended due to the possible damage to compensatory mechanism by hyperextended back extensor muscles." is hardly understandable for me. What are "hyperextended back extensor muscles" - we are talking about hyperlordosis. Extensors tend to be shortened, not extended ... Please re-phrase this passage and make your thoughts more explicit. The major topic of your paper is the speculation about the indication of the method (suitable for which patients? only the wheelchair-bound?)

Further suggestions for minor revisions:

Abstract, l4: "can't" -> cannot. Then start a new sentence: "While surgical treatment usually is neither reported nor recommended in previous studies, we report the first ..."

Abstract, l17, and Conclusion, l32: "under controversial" -> "under controversy" OR "controversial". Then start a new sentence: "We report the first successful case of operative treatment by corrective spine surgery in these rare and demanding patient collective..."

Background, l1, and Conclusion, l29: If you refer to FSHD as the "third" form, you have to comment on the other forms. Otherwise just say "... is a rare form of ..."

Background, l8: "in rest lives" -> during the rest of their life.

Background, l11, and Discussion, l1: "Hyperlordosis is common in FSHD, which is caused by weakness of pelvic extensor and pelvicgirdle muscles" -> FSDH is NOT caused BY weakness, but is the cause FOR weakness! -> "..., which results in weakness of ..." Two times the same sentence in this short report!!!!

Background, l14: recommended
Background, l 15-16: patient, who (not "which")

Background, l 18: can help (remove the "do")

Background, l19: for wheelchair dependent FSDH patients (not: "in wheelchair-dependent")

Case presentation, l26: ... for more than 4 years ...

Case presentation, l30: bilateral inability to completely close the eyes, ...

Discussion, l6: "isn't" -> is not

Discussion, l15: "more powerless" -> weaker

Discussion, l22: What is "ritual life"?

Discussion, l22: "So, the correction is necessary because the rigid internal system could hold the upright sitting posture in consideration of none powerful paraspinal muscles available" please rephrase: what is the "internal system"? can it be "in consideration"? "none powerful" is "powerless" or "weak" or "insufficient"
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