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Author's response to reviews: see over
The authors would like to thank the reviewers for providing comments/suggestions to improve our manuscript. A point-by-point reply to their comments follows:

**Reviewer's report**

**Title:** Scoliosis Research Society Members Attitudes Towards Physical Therapy and Scoliosis Specific Exercises for Adolescent Idiopathic Scoliosis

**Version:** 3  
**Date:** 17 May 2015

**Reviewer:** Raphael Adobor

**Reviewer's report:**

**Minor Essential Revisions.**

The Authors have thoroughly addressed the concerns raised in the previous review. Additionally

1) they should change the title from "Scoliosis Specific Exercises for Adolescent Idiopathic Scoliosis" to "Physiotherapic Scoliosis Specific Exercises for Adolescent Idiopathic Scoliosis for consistency. Title revised.

2) The discussion section still lacks a" Limitation and Strengths" aspect. Since only 22% returned the questionnaires, authors should discuss this as limitation. This might introduce a selection bias or argue if it is representative for the study population.

Sentences added: “There are limitations to this study, foremost of which is the relatively small number of respondents at 22%. This may raise the possibility of selection bias in that only surgeons with a specific interest in the non-operative treatment of AIS may have responded. Yet a substantial number of respondents indicated that they do not prescribe either PT or PSSE. Still, this is a starting point in initiating the discussion on the need for a more robust study on the effectiveness of either PT or PSSE in the treatment of AIS.”

3) Authors should include a conclusion section, stating the main findings of the study.

Sentences added: “The results of this survey show that 22% of the respondents use PSSE for AIS, although skepticism remains regarding the benefit of PSSE for AIS. Support for SRS funded research suggests belief that there is potential benefit from PSSE and the best way to assess that potential is through evidence development.”