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15th August, 2017

Theodoros B. Grivas, MD PhD,
Editor,
Scoliosis and Spinal Disorders.

Dear Dr Grivas,

The authors would like to thank you and the reviewers for re-reviewing our manuscript and the valuable comments to improve it. We would like to clarify the further points made by the reviewers.

We hope you and the reviewers will find our revised manuscript acceptable and worthy of publication. We look forward to your favourable reply.
Please find the revision as detailed below:

Reviewer #1:
Comment 1:
The revised manuscript is much better.
Response 1:
The authors thank the reviewer for the positive comment.

Comment 2:
Brace compliance was rated as good in 70.8% in the experimental group and 79.2% in the historical cohort group. In the experimental group, 66.9% of patients who were compliant to the Schroth exercises had good bracing compliance, whereas only 63.6% of those who were non-compliant to the exercises had good bracing compliance.

So, regarding the brace compliance of the experimental group,

- Schroth complier 66.9%
- Schroth non-complier 63.6%
- Total 70.8%

Some of these values should be incorrect.

Response 2:
Thank you for pointing out the percentages on brace compliance. The authors acknowledge this is slightly confusing, and would like to clarify the figures:

Brace compliance was good in 17 out of 24 patients = 70.8%

Amongst the 24 patients in the experimental group, 13 patients were compliant with Schroth exercises, and 11 patients were non-compliant with Schroth exercises.

Brace compliance was good in 10 out of 13 Schroth complier = 76.9%
Brace compliance was good in 7 out of 11 Schroth non-complier = 63.6%

We have therefore changed the figures accordingly.
Comment 3:

Figure legend

Although the inclusion criteria is Cobb angle of 25-40 degrees, this patient's Cobb angle was 42 degrees.

Response 3:

At our centre, we take all Cobb angles 3 degrees due to measurement error. Hence a 42 degree Cobb angle curve would satisfy our inclusion criteria of within 40 degrees. In order to be consistent and less confusing, the authors have changed the legend accordingly.

Reviewer #2

Comment 1:

Thanks to the authors for taking our first comments into account. The text is ready to be published after correcting a small typo p14 l22 with BRAIST instead of BRIAST.

Response 1:

The authors thank the reviewer for the encouraging comments. We have changed the typo accordingly.

We hope you will find the above responses and revisions acceptable, and look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

Kenny Kwan

On behalf of all authors