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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have revised the manuscript to a satisfactory standard, and as such it is ready for publication after attention to a few minor, discretionary, issues:

Page 4: Paragraph 2 ‘...to investigate if the TIME OF INJURY...’. could be stated clearer. For example, ‘...to investigate if the age at which injury first occurs differs between individuals with different midfoot postures...’

Page 4: Final sentence: ‘...These methods allowed DETERMINING and evaluation of...’. grammatically incorrect. Suggest: ‘...these methods allowed measurement, and evaluation, of the amount of pronation and its significance’.

Page 7: The authors state that there are ‘statistically, but not clinically, significant results. This assertion warrants inclusion of a brief explanatory note.

Page 12: Discussion. The FPI does not just assess arch height, but arch congruence as well. This is a subtle, but I feel important, point. With a supinated foot the apex of the arch moves posteriorly in the arch, and with pronation it moves distal and becomes obscured. This paragraph would be more factually accurate if this were mentioned.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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