Reviewer 2

This systemic review/meta-analysis summarized 10 eligible studies's results on the "Schroth method in the treatment of idiopathic scoliosis". Overall, the meta-analysis is sound and the writing is good with minor English Issues.

Following are some minor issues or comments that needs to be addressed.

1. Table 1: Column "Sessions per week", authors put 2X or 3X week for different studies, it is confusing. I think put just number of sessions is sufficient and clearer.
2. Figures 2-7: Text in the figures are in gray color and font size is too small to read. They should be black color and main manuscript text.
3. Lines 221-222, "This number of " is not clear what to indicate. Does the author indicated the 10 studies included in this systemic review and meta-analysis?
4. Line 227, "A study Kuru et al" should be "A study by Kuru et al".
5. The authors said the age affected the effect size, should the author separate different age of IS and evaluate effect size so that to provide guidance to readers interested in this method for treatment their patients. It is common sense the earlier the correction method is applied; the higher and better correction outcome will achieve. But it is still useful to evaluate how this method's effective size for older patients (adult).
6. Line 282-284 "we had 8 degrees 282 of freedom (df = 8) and they (df = 10)" …. What "they" mean here?
7. Line 286," In the study Park et al", should be "In the study by Park et al".

Our response: We thank you for your constructive criticism.

1. We made a correction in the table according to your advice.
2. We emphasized that we used RevMan and Meta-analyst software. Figures 2 and 3 were created in RevMan software, and Figures 4-7 in Meta-analyst software. The way they are shown represents the conceptual solution of those software, so we cannot make changes in them.
3. Yes, that means the 10 included studies in the meta-analysis, We have made the correction in the text.
4. We have made the correction in the text.
5. To evaluate the effect size according to the age of the subjects in the meta-analysis, it is necessary to perform a subgroup analysis. On lines 265-269, we emphasized that such an analysis was not possible to do, because the data we obtained from the included studies did not allow it. It is certainly important to evaluate the effects of this method on older patients, but above all, there must be such studies to be included in the meta-analysis. However, there are no such studies, and we could not even examine the magnitude of the effect in older respondents. Only the Lee & Lee study has such respondents, which introduces a bit of confusion into our analysis, which we tried to solve with Leave one out analysis.
6. Degrees of freedom indicate the number of effects that are measured in a particular outcome. (df=8) means that 9 effects were measured in the outcome, (df=10) means that 11 effects were measured, etc. In this way, we tried to reach a conclusion, which is why there are certain differences in the effect size between our studies.
7. We have made the correction in the text.