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Reviewer’s report:

This is a very useful paper covering an issue which will be of significant interest to readers of JFAR. I would certainly recommend it for publication but have a few suggestions that may improve clarity.

1. An important consideration is that the term hallux abducto valgus is only really used in the podiatric literature. This study describes a literature search which would have produced very little if that search term alone was used. On this basis the authors may consider using the term hallux valgus which is more universally recognised.

2. Background: Sentence 2 paragraph 1 is stating the obvious. This study is now 19 years out of date and as it is a costing exercise the authors must consider is it really relevant?

3. Para 1 sentence 3, reference 2 this paper describes the condition hallux valgus not hallux abducto valgus. Again the choice of term used by the author is problematic. Similar issues dog almost every reference in this paper.

4. The authors state:

Clinically it is often cited that HAV is more common in female and elderly individuals;[2] however, no synthesis of the current literature or synoptic statement has been made to justify this.

I don’t really understand this as surely most of the references show this to be the case. Certainly one reference (though not of the greatest quality) not used in this paper is quite helpful on this issue:


5. Methods. Data analysis Page 9
Pooled prevalence estimate - this term will mean little to most readers and must be clarified.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable
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