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Reviewer's report:

General
I acknowledge the authors’ efforts in the revision of the manuscript which should have helped to improve the paper. There are still some minor issues that I would ask the authors to address.

-------------------------------------------------------------

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)

Minor Essential Revisions:
• In general: The unit for pressure is kPa not kPa/cm2! Please correct throughout the text.
• P. 2, 3rd paragraph: It should read ‘960, 1020 an 750 kPa’ (not 102)
• P. 3, 2nd paragraph: Please correct
  1. ‘… have separate vocational training which DIFFERS…’
  2. ‘… an orthotist TAKES care of more severe disorders …’
  3. ‘… for the EXTENT of pressure reduction…’
• P. 4, 3rd paragraph: Please specify the term ‘elevated foot pressure’ in terms of the pressure value!
Furthermore, the description of the patients with ‘structural defects leading to functional anomalies’ is a bit vague. Could you please be more specific?
• P. 5, 1st paragraph: Please explain how the orthoses were ‘evaluated for adequacy’. What the evaluation performed before or after the pressure measurements and were the results used for the evaluation?
• P. 5, 2nd paragraph: The term ‘on-plantar pressure’ is new to me, why not use ‘plantar pressure’?
• P. 7, 2nd paragraph: I am still not happy with the mere mentioning of the ‘Root style’ orthoses. It is a bit cumbersome to go back to other publications to find out how they are designed. Why don’t you briefly describe their main characteristics?
• P. 8, 1st-4th paragraph: Please provide p-values for the differences in the results or state that they were not significant.
• P. 9, 1st paragraph: Please change ‘statistically significant greater’ to ‘significantly greater’. Furthermore, please don’t forget the units after giving numbers.
• P. 9, 2nd paragraph: Please add after ‘…68, 65 and 81 out of 100…’
• P. 10, 1st paragraph: Please add ‘… years OF professional experience …’ and change ‘pedorthists DID not differ…’
• P. 10, 3rd paragraph: Shouldn’t it be 93 pairs = 186 orthoses (instead of 31 pairs). Suggest replacing ‘as a mean’ by ‘on average’
• P. 11, 3rd paragraph: a word is missing after ‘However, there was no RELATIONSHIP for podiatrists…’
• P. 12, 1st paragraph: ‘… AN important aim of…’
• P. 13, 1st paragraph: Please use the official citation for the EMED abstract. It has been published
in Clinical Biomechanics (Bristol, Avon). 2005;20(8)

Discretionary Revisions

• In the whole text: I would still prefer ‘forefoot’ as one word (as opposed to ‘fore foot’ which is not wrong but less commonly used if you check for example medline). However you decide to use it please be consistent. (on page 11 you use it as one word)

• Tables Please correct the units in tables 2 and 3.

Further more, in table 2 I do not understand why two values are marked in ‘B right’ and ‘C left’ as highest pressures

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No