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"The association between foot-care self efficacy beliefs and actual foot-care behaviour in people with peripheral neuropathy: a cross-sectional study"

Perrin et al. 2008
Response from the comments made by the editors 21\textsuperscript{st} January 2009

The authors of the above manuscript thank and are grateful to the editors their final comments. Below are the responses to these comments (these came in two separate emails):

\textbf{From editorial@jfootankleres.com}

1. In the title, change the final hyphen (i.e. â€“â€“ a cross sectional studyâ€™) to a colon (i.e. â€“â€“ a cross sectional studyâ€™).
   This has been done- see title page

2. In the first sentence of the â€“Backgroundâ€™ (page 4), please add commas after the words â€“diabetesâ€™ and â€“amputationâ€™, so the sentence reads, â€“Foot pathology as a consequence of diabetes, such as foot ulceration leading to lower limb amputation, is commonâ€™. In addition, I suggest that you remove the word â€“increasingâ€™ towards the end of this sentence as it probably is not required â€“ an epidemic is an epidemic, and as such, it appears inappropriate to have an â€“increasing epidemicâ€™.
   This has been done as suggested- see page 4, first sentence

3. In the second full sentence on Page 5, please change the sentence to: â€“Two small cross-sectional studies from Europe found that in people at high risk of foot complications who were issued custom-made footwear to protect their feet only 22\% wore their shoes all day and 53\% most of the day respectively [15, 16].
   This has been done as suggested- see page 5, first full sentence
   Please also make sure that all mention of study design â€“cross-sectionalâ€™ has a hyphen between the two words for consistency.
   This has been done. Please note that this required a hyphen to be used in the title where it was not used before.

4. Page 7, last paragraph, second sentence beginning â€“Participants providedâ€™: suggest adding the word â€“wereâ€™ in the following section â€“â€“being interviewed and were assessedâ€™.
   This has been done as suggested- see page 7, second sentence

5. Page 10, first paragraph, 7th and 8th lines: you used the word â€“howeverâ€™ twice within two sentences. It should generally only be used once in a paragraph as it flips an argument 180 degrees, so if you flip it again, you end up where you started from. I suggest changing the second use of the word to â€“Althoughâ€™ (i.e. â€“Although, those that had a history of foot pathologyâ€™).
   This has been done as suggested- see page 10, 1\textsuperscript{st} paragraph, final sentence

6. Page 13, 6th line: check spacing (i.e. may be a double space) between the words â€“quantitativeâ€™ and â€“techniquesâ€™.
   Corrected

7. Page 13, final sentence in the 'Discussion' about sample size and power. I suggest discussing this further with the Deputy Editor, Dr Karl Landorf, by phone +613 9479 5300 or via e-mail k.landorf@latrobe.edu.au
This issue was discussed with Dr. Landorf. The text describing the sample size and statistical power issues has been replaced with (page 13, final paragraph of discussion):

“Finally, it is important to be aware of the issue of sample size and its effect on tests of significance in relation to correlations we determined in our study. As the sample size was relatively large, we have taken a more conservative approach that focused on the correlation coefficient, which was poor. Although the correlation between FCCS scores and preventative behaviour scores was just statistically significant (p = 0.05), the correlation was actually poor (r = 0.02). A larger sample size would have ensured more statistical power, although the clinical implications of this are unknown.”

From indiepreaccept@biomedcentral.com

Major revisions (we require you to make these):

References - the url in reference 35 does not appear to be correct. Please check.
The URL was last checked 27th January 2009. It is the correct report. Page 261 of the report contains the relevant information.

References - The reference list should contain all authors’ names, if there are 30 or below. The term et al. should not be used.
It was reference 9 that was problematic (page 15). This has now been corrected.

Minor revisions (we can make these on your behalf):

Table vertical elements - Please note that we are unable to display vertical rules within the tables - please re-layout your table without these vertical elements.

We would be grateful if you could make this change on our behalf.

Figure title - The image file should not include the title (e.g. Figure 1... etc.) or figure number. The legend and title should be part of the manuscript file after the reference list. The figures are numbered automatically in the order in which they are uploaded.
This problem has been corrected. See the newly uploaded files.

Figure cropping - It is important for the final layout of the manuscript that the figures are cropped as closely as possible to minimise white space around the image. Our online figure guide contains full details for preparing files for submission and can be viewed here: http://www.biomedcentral.com/info/ifora/figures

We would be grateful if you could do this on our behalf.

Other

After discussion with Dr. Landorf it was discovered that the statistical analysis section of the methods section could be better clarified. So, in consultation with Dr. Landorf the final paragraph of the methods section (page 9) is as follows:

“SPSS 14.0 was used for the analyses. To determine the relationship of FCCS scores with both preventative and potentially damaging behaviour scores the Pearson product-moment coefficient of correlation was determined in each case. For these correlation analyses, an α < 0.05 was considered significant. A multiple analysis of variance test (with Bonferroni-type adjustment) was used to compare mean FCCS scores and behaviour subscale scores for participants that had
a history of diabetes-related pathology with those that did not. Due to the Bonferroni-type adjustment, an \( \alpha < 0.017 \) was considered significant for this test.”