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Reviewer's report:

Thankyou for responding to my comments during my initial review. Unfortunately, there are some minor queries that need to be addressed before the manuscript can be accepted for publication.

Major Compulsory Revisions:

Discussion section:

The 95% Limits of agreement (LOA) statistic has been now been used to assess the reliability and validity of the Sit-to-Stand test.

The mean change in arch height during this test is ~1cm (SD 0.34), yet the intra-rater reliability 95% LOA calculations were ~ -0.4 to 0.7, -0.7 to 0.7 and -0.5 to 1.1 cm for the three raters. The inter-rater reliability calculations are similar.

The authors state that the differences between raters are "small" (in the discussion). Can you please justify this? The reference values for "abnormal" arch height change are stated to be <0.64cm and >1.35cm. Based on the 95% LOA values would it be possible for a rater (or two different raters) to classify a foot as normal on one test occasion, then abnormal on another?

A similar query applies to the value of the 95% LOA statistic for assessing agreement between the clinical measure and radiographic measure of arch height change.


Minor Essential Revisions:

In some places, the references are positioned after a full-stop whilst in others the referencing is before the full stop. Please amend this consistent with journal guidelines.

Page 8: replace "+" with "±".

There are several instances whereby a zero has not been inserted before a decimal point (in text and Table 6).

During the discussion section, the authors have referred to Tables presented in the Results (Page 13 and 14). Please delete this.
Tables 2 and 3: Please replace "R" with "r" for the column titles using the words "intra-Rater", "inter-Rater".

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.