

Brace Features	Chêneau Gensingen GBW	Boston Brace	Rigo RSC	SpineCor
Rigid TLSO	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Compression	No	Yes	No	Yes
3D Correction	Yes	No	Yes	Claims to
CAD/CAM standardization* in U.S.	Yes	No	No	No
3D scan measurement – accuracy	Yes	Yes	?*	?*
Curve-pattern specific	Yes	Limited	Yes	Limited
Asymmetric w/voids(holes) at concavities – corrective breathing	Yes	No	Not all (see photo)	No
Lighter compared to other rigid	Yes	No	?*	N/A
Less hip compared to others	Yes	No	No	No
Strives for overcorrection	Yes	No	Yes	No
Aim: curve reduction vs. stopping progression	Yes	No	Yes	No
Schroth BestPractice® compatible	Yes	No	No	No
Brace & Schroth methodology – one location, year-round	Yes	No	No	No
Goals include improving postural appearance/reducing prominence	Yes	Yes	Yes	?
Front closure	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Bracing for mild to 49° Cobb angle	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bracing for severe curves 50°+	Yes	No	Yes	No
Consistent in-brace corrections 30°–50°; < 4 day measure–final fit	Yes	?*	?*	No
% Effective rate	95%+	72%	?	Not comparable
Addresses pain in adults	Yes	No	?	Claims to

\*Lack of standardization means brace fit subject to individual practitioner skills & subject to error.

?\*Depends on individual brace and practitioner.