

Response Letter to Reviewers

Dear Sirs,

Thanks for the time and effort devoted to reviewing our manuscript

Ref.: Ms. No. 64624

Title: " Anterior Vertebral Body Tethering for Idiopathic Scoliosis in Growing Children: a systematic review"

Please find below the list of suggestions and respective answers.

REVIEWER #1

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors:

The study describes the effectiveness of management of idiopathic scoliosis with anterior vertebral body tethering for three-dimensional deformity correction without compromising the spinal and chest growth left in the children. They noted that the procedure has moderate success rate and needs further long term follow-up studies and high quality evidence to support its regular use in practice. This was the first systematic review on the subject to consider the procedure for idiopathic scoliosis. The conclusions were based on the results obtained. Authors recommend future studies to confirm the surgical criteria for AVBT, prove tethering long-term effectiveness and safety, focus on patient-reported outcomes measures (PROMs) and propose strategies to avoid perioperative complications and long-term implant failures. They also proposed for development of a more durable, fatigue-resistant cable to prevent the high number of broken tethers observed in the published studies. The study is limited by the quality of evidence. This article would be of high value to be added to the literature on the subject. There are a few suggestions to improve the quality of the manuscript.

1. Line 19 remaining typo

AUTHORS' REPLY: The correction has been made.

2. Line 50 remove hyphen Avoid breaking the lines abruptly in many places. Club them into short paragraphs rather than single line statements.

AUTHORS' REPLY: The suggested correction has been made.

3. Although authors have used a quality assessment tool by AAOS clinical practice guideline and review methodology version 2, it would be ideal to present the findings in a table to the readers either in the main text or as a supplementary material.

AUTHORS' REPLY: The supplementary table 1 was added to the revised version of the manuscript.

4. The authors are also suggested to submit a sample search strategy in at least one of the databases to validate and promote the repeatability of the study.

AUTHORS' REPLY: The sample search strategy in PubMed was added as a supplementary file.

5. The authors also suggested to submit the list of full text articles screened & excluded with reasons for better validation to the study methodology.

AUTHORS' REPLY: The list of full-text articles screened with reasons has been added as supplementary file.