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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting study which contributes to the woefully sparse literature on the prevalence of foot problems in older people. The methodology is appropriate, although the fact that only those with foot pain were invited to participate in the study may have skewed the results somewhat, as did the exclusion of those incapable of walking household distances unaided (as this would have excluded those whose mobility problems were a direct result of their foot pain). It would have been more interesting to survey all willing participants which would then have enabled comparison of the podiatric, and other, data between those reporting and not reporting pain. However, I recognise that this was not the main focus of the study. The authors identify that the use of a convenience sample also limits the validity of the prevalence estimates.

Minor essential revisions:

The p-values are inconsistently reported. In places they are given as exact values, in others as <.05 (etc). They should be reported in the same way (preferably as exact values) throughout.

The associations between MFPDI and SF-36 scores are reported as 'significant' if the p value associated with the correlation coefficient is <0.05 or <0.1. However, this is of limited value, informing the reader only that there is some degree of correlation (i.e. not zero). The text merely reports that there were significant associations between (nearly) all scores, yet some correlation coefficients are below 0.2, whilst others are nearly 0.7. The strengths of the various associations should be commented on in the text.

Table 4, and its associated text relating to the frequency of dichotomise MFPDI items, is not clear. There needs to be a clear explanation of the original response levels, which of these were combined to make the two transformed levels and for which of these two levels the frequencies are given in the table.
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