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Reviewer's report:

Congratulation on the submission of this manuscript. There are several things that I may recommend for your consideration:

1) In the Methods section, there is no mention of the curve type(s) of these patients. This may be very important to know, as a balanced double curve may appear more symmetrical compared to an unbalanced double curve; a single major lumbar curve may have more waist asymmetry compared to a single major thoracic curve, etc. Also, may be important to discuss female: male ratio in your studied patient population.

2) Due to this reason above, as a reader I would also be curious to also see the correlations of curve type/balance of curve integrated into the results. Thus, calculations looking at correlation between curve type and SRS-22 domains may add important information your Results section.

4) In the discussion section, there is short paragraph about the symmetry of faces and that "it is reasonable to assume that this would also be true for the back." I do not believe this paragraph adds value to the discussion of this paper. The authors are not providing research to demonstrate this assumption, thus removing this paragraph may help strengthen the Discussion section.

5) The Discussion section, in general, provides very little discussion about THIS paper and its contribution to the current literature. There is very little discussion about your results other than the mentions of the correlations being weak. There is significant, but important, discussion about the work of others, however discussing THIS paper and how it is related to current literate would strengthen this section. Also, I do not see a statement about limitations of the study.

6) I do not believe that this paper cannot conclude that "the development of a combined pictorial and textual scale should be considered." The purpose of this paper and the experimental design do not lead to this conclusion. I like that it was discussed in the Discussion section, however, and still adds value to the paper.

Thank you for taking the time to review my comments.
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