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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Editor in Chief,

Please find enclosed our manuscript and additional files entitled “Effect of shoes on the gait of children: a systematic review and meta-analysis” following a second review. Below is a point-by-point response to each reviewer. Their recommendations have largely been implemented.

All authors have approved the revisions to the manuscript.

Kind regards

Caleb Wegener
Adrienne Hunt
Benedicte Vanwanseele
Joshua Burns
Richard Smith
Title: Effect of children's shoes on gait: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Reviewer: Meredith Wilkinson

Reviewer's comment: Methods, Search strategy. 1st paragraph last line. Should this now read ‘updated in October 2010’?

Authors’ response: The thesis added to the review was identified via contact with experts in the area. The electronic search process was not updated.

Reviewer's comment: Study quality. Last line. In the references relating to the five studies randomizing order of interventions, reference 25 should be included.

Original: “In five studies the order of interventions was randomised [9, 20-22].”

Authors’ response: The relevant reference, 20, has been added to the text.

“In five studies the order of interventions was randomised [9, 20-23]”

Reviewer's comment: Discussion, 1st paragraph. Last line. Could this sentence be reworded or explained? And should this sentence now read, a maximum of six studies (rather than five)?

Original: “Meta-analyses between the included studies were restricted to a maximum of five studies for three variables.”

Authors’ response: The sentence has been revised to address the reviewer’s comments. The maximum number of studies that were combined has remained at five.

“The maximum number of studies that were able to be combined for meta-analyses was limited to five studies between the three variables of stride length, walking velocity and cadence.”

Reviewer's comment: The variables upon which meta analysis could be performed is confusing. As written at the end of the discussion on kinematic findings (Walking, Paragraph 4), would it be appropriate to add a sentence which lists those spatio-temporal variables that underwent meta-analysis at the end of the discussion section of these variables. (Walking Paragraph 2)
Authors’ response: The following paragraph has been added to the discussion section.

“Spatio-temporal walking variables showed greater homogeneity for meta-analyses than studies investigating other categories of biomechanical variables. Between two and five studies were able to be combined for meta-analyses for 9 of the 17 spatio-temporal walking variables.”

Reviewer: Daniel Bonanno
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No comments