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Reviewer’s report:

This is a good pilot study. The manuscript would be enhanced by improved correlation between types of footwear worn and the clinical indices collected such as the LFIS and the HAQ. Improved discussion of the limitations. 'The study is not without it's limitations..' is not an appropriate way to address these.

1. Minor revision: Jandals is a tradename and I had to ‘google’ this to find out what they were. It is explained in the discussion section but explanation in the methods would be appropriate.

2. Minor revision: Under ‘Footwear assessment’ in Results section, this sentence needs correcting: No shoes were found to be wearing ‘average’ footwear.

3. Major compulsory revision: Table 2 is labelled ‘The relationship between shoe type (good, poor and average) and foot function and structure. In reality, this table just gives the baseline median and IQR for the forefoot and rearfoot structural indices and the LFIS. This is important information but also the relationship between shoe type and foot function and structure would be valuable, even though it is cross sectional data. Could the authors please include this data and add to the results section or to Table 2.

4. Major compulsory revision: Cost did not seem to be included in reasons for choice of footwear whereas in reality this is a common reason for poor footwear choice.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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