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Reviewer’s report:

This manuscript has been revised to include key information that was lacking previously. In particular the statement of aims at the end of the Introduction is helpful. The findings of the rotational correction remaining stable and lack of rib hump recurrence are important, though specific to an anterior fusion technique. However, the manuscript still is difficult to understand, and several recommendations are made for including additional information to improve its clarity and readability:

Abstract: The abbreviation TASF should be defined at its first occurrence.

Page 6, line 3: under Post-operative Imaging: "the rib hump was clinically measured with a Scoliometer." The Scoliometer is not an Imaging method. Then, Results are subsequently given for pre- and post-operative changes in rib hump and Cobb angle. So authors should provide a section also on Pre- and Post-operative measurements, and also move the details about the Scoliometer and smart-phone methodology from the Introduction to the Methods.

Page 9, line 12: The heading 'Cobb Angles' is unclear - it apparently refers only to the use of reformatted CT images post-operatively. The Results (Page 10, line 12) give findings about both pre- and post-surgery Cobb angles - both should be included in the Methods as noted above. The point about validity of comparisons (page 9, line 17) should be expanded to address the pre-post Cobb angle comparison results.

Page 11, line 11-12: This reference to the Figures showing examples of rotational changes is not a result, and should be moved down into next paragraph to illustrate the result. Also the Figure and/or legends should be expanded to indicate which (all?) levels were fused, and the level of the curve apex.
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