Reviewer's report

Title: Evaluation of the accuracy of shoe fitting in older people using three-dimensional foot scanning

Version: 1 Date: 5 December 2013

Reviewer: Anita Williams

Reviewer's report:

thank you to the authors for this extremely interesting paper - I apologise for the delay in reviewing it - for some reason it escaped my attention.

It is a well written paper and very timely given the drive to use scanning technology in clinical practice (I know that the scanning was used for assessing the footwear dimensions - but this is an interesting debate nevertheless! - see comment under discussion) Also I fully agree, footwear fitting still has to remain an art as well as a science!

The focus of the study is well justified in the background/intro; the method is well described and the results presented very clearly. The discussion is well balanced and identifies both the strengths and the potential weaknesses.

Discretionary revisions

You do describe this study as part of a larger trial which you reference. The detail about the trial I think can be removed ie 'Briefly, the trial is a two-group randomised controlled trial design with a 16-week follow-up period, with participants randomly allocated to either a “usual care” control group or the intervention group’. or alternatively describe what the usual care and the intervention are and then that the intervention was the Dr Comfort shoes (or is this the usual care?) Anyhow this was a little confusing and just needs a minor amend for clarification.

Also, there needs to be a clearer message for clinical practice within the discussion. It is alluded to in respect of footwear fit (and some mention of patient choice for longer shoes). Maybe the message is around the tools (whether the Brannock device or scanning) and that these offer a guide to fit but patient preferences can be taken into account if we are to achieve the patient focussed outcomes that we wish for (Art and science!).

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.
Declaration of competing interests:

'I declare that I have no competing interests'