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Reviewer's report:

General

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

I have read the reviewers comments I am happy with their responses. They have spent a considerable amount of time reflecting on the reviewer's comments. The paper is much easier to read although there is one or two areas that might confuse people, in particular the self-reporting of 'importance of pressure reduction' and 'walking convenience'. However, I am happy for the paper to be published. Just three minor points:

Page 4: median experience can just have the years without the range
Page 9: remove all the r, b, f and p-values from the 'importance of pressure reduction.'
Table 4: Label should read: Mean effect of orthoses on walking convenience (mm)

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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