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Reviewer’s report:

1 Previous comment: Figure 1: should all those in the non-completions box (with the exception of the person who refused), not be Excluded, as you could not verify that they still had foot pain?

The authors excluded 134 people because they no longer had foot pain. I wondered if they should treat those who could not be contacted in the same way (because they don’t know if they still have foot pain or not). Thinking about it again, I think the authors are correct on this one. I’m more than happy for it to stay as it is.

2 Previous comment: I am not convinced that Figure 2 and 3 add anything to the paper, as the information is also given in the tables. If you choose to keep Figure 2 though, could confidence intervals be added?

I had intended that the authors add confidence intervals to Figure 2, rather than the Tables, but I think this is fine – not incorrect.

New points

3 Last 2 sentences of “Setting and study population”. I think there is a full stop missing between “foot pain” and “Those”.

4 I think it should be Stata, rather than STATA, as it is not an acronym.

5 The word ‘pilot’ is still used in the Discussion, for consistency, maybe this should be ‘preliminary’, as in the Introduction?
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