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The Editor

Journal of Foot and Ankle Research

Dear Sir/Madam,

Thank you for considering the publication of this revised manuscript:

**Screening for foot problems in children – is this practice justifiable?**

This manuscript is re-submitted in a re-edited form as requested and complies with the criteria specified by the authors instruction for JFAR.

This is a single author manuscript which has not been and will not be submitted for publication elsewhere.

There are no competing nor financial interests to declare.

This paper contributes to the area of paediatric foot assessment and the practice of podiatry screenings. The WHO criteria are used as a ‘benchmark’ for review purposes.

In response to the second round of peer reviewer and editorial comments, a point-by-point summary of author responses is provided as follows:

**Reviewer 1 (Williams)**

Reference details have been amended to reflect author guidelines and Editorial comments.

Thank you for your helpful review of this manuscript.

**Reviewer 2 (Wilkinson)**

Minor essential revisions

Page 5 - added ‘be’ as suggested

Page 6 – wording changed as suggested

Page 8/3rd para – amended by adding the word ‘developing’ cervical cancer – to clarify the meaning here (Reviewer 3 also supported this amendment*)
Page 9 – I have read this a few more times, and left as is – the sentence serves to lead to applying WHO criteria to paediatric feet.

Page 9, p12, p18, Table 2 – the formatting of these areas will change the text positions in due course

Page 13 – have added a sentence to make this link and hence the inclusion of Fig 4 more apparent. Thank you, it did need this amendment.

The positioning of the Fig/Table legends and entities is as requested within the JFAR guidelines and will be ‘rearranged’ with proof preparation.

Thank you for your very helpful and constructive comments.

Reviewer 3 (Harris)

Thank you for your helpful comments and feedback.

Page 7 – Just for your interest, the following link further supports the discussion of BCG vaccine in Australia:

Page 8 – amended by adding the word ‘developing’ cervical cancer – to clarify the meaning here (Reviewer 2 also supported this amendment*)

“Nett” – thank you for this point regarding the Webster versus Oxford dictionary stipulations. I opt to maintain ‘nett’, but will defer to editorial advice and decision in this instance.

Editor’s comment

1. the title has been amended as suggested using a colon, and uploaded to read ‘practice’
2. amended as suggested
3. comma deleted
4. comma inserted
5. ‘and’ added as suggested
6. changed as suggested ie ‘has been’
7. SA defined as suggested
8. ‘and inserted as suggested
9. commas used for thousands, here and throughout
10. comma deleted
11. dash replaced here and throughout
12. italics removed from quote, here and throughout
13. dot points removed and commas used instead
14. ‘but’ used as suggested
15. AHMAC defined
16. ‘condition’ used rather than pathology
17. ref 11 inserted at the end of the three relevant paragraphs
18. dashes replaced with colons as requested
19. full-stops removed from all sub-headings
20. reworded as suggested
21. comma deleted after (p-FFP)
22. reworded as suggested
23. dot points removed and commas used
24. comma deleted
25. capital ‘P’ replaced with ‘p’
26. italics removed and quote appended with reference
27. comma deleted after Pertinent
28. Table 1: SA spelt out in both places
29. Fig 1: AHMAC defined
30. Fig 3: full ref details included
31. Fig 5: full ref details included
32. ‘ref type’ removed from all references as requested
33. Ref 7: journal abbrev corrected
34. Ref 29: full ref details included
35. Ref 39: font corrected
36. Ref 48: journal abbrev corrected
37. Ref 49 re-checked original article at BMJ online, and this is the recommended citation (and the only one available). Is this ok, or what else would you suggest please?
38. Figures: I have checked all Figs and reduced white space with shading added in Figs 2 and 3. Both are re-uploaded. Figs 1 and 4 had no capacity for further white space reduction, and remain unchanged. I hope these are ok in this way.
39. Fig 5 has been re-formatted as requested and uploaded

Please contact me to clarify any aspects of this re-submission and thank you for considering this revised manuscript.

Yours faithfully,

Angela Evans PhD