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Reviewer’s report:

- Major Compulsory Revisions
The IPA convention used needs to be described and quoted eg J.A.Smith (1998. However, this said, I feel that this is a thematic analysis not IPA and the analysis carried out does not address “the assumption in IPA .. that the analyst is interested in learning something about the respondent’s psychological world……meaning is central, and the aim is to try to understand the content and complexity of those meanings rather than measure their frequency”. I do not feel that the analysis adds such a level of interpretation and does not discuss issues such as participant’s “stance” and therefore it does not have the “interpretative” aspect above a thematic analysis. Thematic analysis here is carried out soundly and I feel that it is not inferior to IPA in any way to answer the questions set out in this study.

This is a small one-off sample (all female) and so the author must take caution over comments such as in Results; Theme 5; “gender appeared to influence the patient-practitioner relationship”. The point about relating to other females is valid but can’t really be referred to as a gender affect when there is no comparator or negative case analysis that can be carried out due to the lack of male participants.

- Discretionary Revisions
I would like to know a bit more about where this is going to go next, how combine what we have learnt here with patient interviews and how generalise out eg survey of more podiatrists etc?

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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