Reviewer's report

Title: Reliability of capturing foot parameters using 3D non-contact digitisation and the neutral suspension casting technique

Version: 1 Date: 18 August 2010

Reviewer: Craig Payne

Reviewer's report:

This project is well conducted, well planned and well written up. I see no issues with the analysis of the data and the conclusion drawn by the authors is supported by the data. I have no real issues with it except for a couple of minor points:

My understanding is the more common terminology for the device the authors used is ‘digital scanning’ and the authors have called it ‘3d non-contact digitisation’, which is probably correct, but as a reader it was not until well into the manuscript did I get to understand that they were using a ‘digital scanner’. I misunderstood that the ‘3d non-contact digitisation’ was actually something different, which it wasn't. Perhaps the authors need to better explain this early in the manuscript to avoid misunderstanding or confusion.

The only other minor point is the statement on page 12 of the manuscript that "It would also be of benefit to investigate a full cost analysis study to ascertain the clinical viability of the technique". I have actually done that study: Payne CB. Cost benefit comparison of plaster casts and optical scans of the foot for the manufacture of foot orthoses. Australas J Podiatr Med 2007;41(2):29-31
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