Reviewer's report

Title: The Bangla clubfoot tool: development and repeatability

Version: 2
Date: 3 December 2013

Reviewer: Paul Gibbons

Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. I have a major concern that whilst the Bangla Clubfoot Tool may be reliable the authors have not demonstrated its validity with respect to outcomes yet their use of the terms "robust" and "pertinent" suggest that it is so. For it to be acceptable for publication it would need to be rewritten in such a way that this deficiency in the paper is addressed and a discussion about the lack of proven validity is included.

2. The ICC for the parental sub-rating score was 0.48, implying poor reliability. Should it be excluded from the Tool?

Minor Essential Revisions
1. Abstract/Results. Line 1: delete "been"
2. Results. 2nd sentence. Mean age 2.4 years - in Abstract Mean age quoted as 2.6 years
3. Results. 2nd sentence. Youngest aged 1.3 years - Abstract states that the study was conducted in children who had been (sic) commenced treatment......at least 2 years earlier
4. Results. Line 7: what does the number in brackets after the Pirani score indicate?
5. Discussion. Line 12: Please clarify what is meant by clubfoot "resolve". Does this mean tendency to recurrence?

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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.

Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests