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Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential Revisions

The article will be of interest to clinicians and researchers in the field of foot type. The study is of importance in identifying foot type in older adults.

Overall

The manuscript requires proof reading as there are minor typo and grammar errors.

One could argue that two standard from the mean accounts for 95 percent from the mean. Please can the authors debate the issues using 1 SD from the mean accounting for 68 percent from the mean.

Methods

Delete the median score from the A1 scores

Please can the authors describe how and why 20 footprints were needed for this study?

Move ethical approval sentence under participant’s information.

Statistical analysis

No need for the equation to be included

The argument that A1 technique is a "gold standard" can be quite contentious. Please can the authors review the term?

Discussion

The authors describe the examiners to have a "slight tendency" to categorize..... Please reword

The last sentence before the conclusions describes "other foot assessments".... Please can the authors be more explicit and give examples.

Conclusion

Add "for older adults" to the first sentence

Other comments

I am unclear of the need for Figure 1 and Figure 3.
**Level of interest:** An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

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