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Dear Editor,

I am submitted a revised paper based on the comments from the reviewers. Please see below for a point by point response:

Reviewer 1:
There is a mismatch between the p value in the results in the main body of the paper and the abstract - I think an extra zero has been put into the abstract results.

Response
The p value in the abstract has been corrected to p=0.044 from p=0.004.

The paper states you use simple randomisation - is this true? With exact numbers in each group this suggests you may have used blocking if so this needs to be stated with the block size.

Response
We used simple randomisation on the advice of our TSC chair. This is illustrated by table 1, most notably the distribution in Central and Manor clinics. It is pure chance that the numbers came out equal. Hence no changes have been made to the manuscript.

Reviewer 2:
In the background, it is mentioned that Podiatrists are reluctant to use them due to concern for potential complications. It was noted that 4 adverse events were reported. In view of the stated concern, the authors may wish to elaborate on the nature of these?

Response
Details of the 4 adverse events have been put in the manuscript as requested (compliance and adverse events).

Please contact me if you require any further information.

Kind regards,

Dr Lisa Farndon (on behalf of the authors)
Podiatric Development Facilitator