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**Reviewer's report:**

Discretionary Revisions

1. In the abstract-results section on page 3 the authors state ‘.....indicating some sensitivity of the instrument to detect a pathological population’. Would it be more precise to say ‘certain structural pathological populations’? The authors state in the results section under the sub-heading of ‘Differences between pathological groups’ on page 8 that certain conditions (pathologies) not normally associated with structural change were comparable with the normal population, where as the neurogenic cavus and idiopathic cavus group (structural pathologies) were clearly different and represented a pathological population. I think there is a difference between the two (structural and non-structural pathologies) and for the sake of clarity it would help to be specific on the instrument’s sensitivity to detect which type of pathology.

2. In the background section page 4 paragraph 3–what is the Rasch model? A brief explanation would help the reader.

3. Page 10 paragraph 3–would it read better ‘Such sampling methods are extremely resource intensive and financially costly, where as the retrospective compilation of a large sample from existing sources covering both normal and pathological subgroups was felt to be a realistic compromise between impact and resource.’ Rather than ‘......financially costly however, and the retrospective compilation....’

4. Page 11-3rd paragraph. The authors stated ‘In summary, this study has provided a set of definitive normative values for FPI scores’. In light of the study numbers (619) and the study limitations highlighted on page 10-3rd paragraph is the evidence/data strong enough to be deemed definitive? If not then another wording should be used.

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.