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Reviewer’s report:

The authors present a well-written, succinct report of the difference in prevalence of disabling foot pain when different case definitions are used. The methods are rigorous and well executed with appropriate statistical analyses and the tables and figures support the results appropriately. The discussion is well considered and the conclusions are clear.

The message of the paper is clear in that using a different definition of the MFPDI, a more sensitive prevalence estimate can be made for ‘disabling’ foot pain. This provides additional information to support previous cited work that had originally proposed using alternative definitions of disabling foot pain for prevalence studies.

I just have three minor discretionary comments for the authors to consider:

• Consider using the word ‘gender’ instead ‘sex’.
• Within your aim at the end of the last paragraph in your background section, consider changing ‘pilot’ to ‘preliminary’ work.
• In Tables 1-8 it would be really useful to add within the title or the table itself that the numbers relate to N (%).
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