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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Dr. Piqué-Vidal, Dr. Roddy and Dr. Nix.

We would like to thank the editor and all the referees for the comments on our manuscript and the interest in our article "A comparison of hallux valgus angles assessed with computerised plantar pressure measurements, clinical examination and radiography in patients with diabetes".

We have changed the manuscript according to the comments of the reviewers. Our reply to the issues the reviewers have raised together with the changes made in the manuscript are listed (numbered) below. Next to this, we made a small change in the article title: “patients with diabetes” instead of “diabetic patients”. We realise that this is a more respectful approach to these patients who have more features than being “diabetic”.

The changes made in the manuscript are highlighted. We hope that the revised manuscript is now acceptable for publication in Foot and Ankle research.

**Comments Editor**

1) Please remove qualifications from the ‘suffix’ section of the authors' names.

Sorry, but we do not know the meaning of this remark. Perhaps you can give us an example or help us in another way to understand it, so we can make adequate changes.

2) Abstract: remove italics from p values (but keep the p itself italicised). This applies to the rest of the document.

We have changed all the "p"'s in italics and removed it from the value.

3) Background: connect first 2 paragraphs.

We have connected the first two paragraphs in the background section.

4) Remove 'limitations' subheading from discussion.

We have removed the 'limitations' subheading from the discussion.

5) Please merge Figures 1a, 1b and 1c into the one figure file and re-label it Figure 1.

We have done that.

6) References: there are several errors in the reference list (formatting, journal abbreviations etc). Please check carefully and amend as necessary. eg: the abbreviation fot The Foot is simply Foot.

We have changed a number of references accordingly.

**Comments reviewer: Carlos Piqué**

No concerns to the manuscript and the article can be accepted without a new revision
Comments reviewer: Edward Roddy

1) All bar one of the comments have satisfactorily responded. The authors have responded satisfactorily to all of my comments bar one. In the background section they have now added the pooled prevalence estimates identified by the systematic review of Nix et al. However, in the abstract they state that the highest prevalence of 35.7% is for patients with diabetes when this should be in adults aged over 65 years.

We changed the abstract accordingly and this agrees with the background section: “Hallux valgus deformity is a common musculoskeletal foot disorder with a prevalence of 3.5% in adolescents to 35.7% in adults aged over 65 year.”

2) Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

We revised the manuscript for the quality of written English accordingly especially grammatically. See also remark 5 of Sheree Nix

Comments reviewer: Sheree Nix

Minor Compulsory Revisions

1) Abstract/Background – Currently reads “...with a prevalence of 3.5% in adolescents to 35.7% in patients with diabetes.” While the authors have revised the maximum prevalence correctly in the manuscript, the abstract should be corrected to read “…35.7% in adults aged over 65 years.”

We changed the abstract accordingly. See also remark 1 of Edward Roddy.

2) Introduction - While the authors have included the references as suggested, this section lacks flow, while other parts of the introduction are quite lengthy and could be revised to be more concise.

We revised the introduction section accordingly.

3) Methods/Statistical Analyses – the explanation given for ICC values (suggested by Dr Roddy) is currently inadequate and does not give the reader a reference for what is good/very good (i.e. >0.6, >0.7, >0.8, >0.9?). A reputable reference should be provided.

We changed the text in the method/statistical section and give an explanation to interpreting ICC values. We added the sentence: “In accordance with Landis and Koch, the following ICC interpretation scale was used: poor to fair (below 0.4), moderate (0.41–0.60), excellent (0.61–0.80), and almost perfect (0.81–1).”

We also added the following reference:

4) Tables and Figures – Overall, I am happy to leave this issue to the Editor’s discretion regarding the number of figures and tables. However, I feel that Figures 2-4 do not add anything to the paper and the axes are not sufficiently labelled at present. Furthermore, Tables 1-2 have been presented as Figures and are not appropriately labelled.

We labeled the axes of figures 2-4 sufficiently. If the reviewers opinion is to reduce the number of figures and remove figures 2-4 we will agree with the decision. Furthermore, we labelled tables 1-2 appropriately and paste them into the end of the document text file as ‘table object’, like described in “instructions for authors”. 
5) Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

We revised the manuscript for the quality of written English accordingly especially grammatically. See also remark 2 of Edward Roddy

We hope that we have corrected the deficiencies that you had mentioned and have provided adequate answers on your questions.

Best regards,

Daniël MC Janssen

On behalf of the co-authors:
Antal P Sanders
Nick A Guldemond
Joris Hermus
Gerard HIM Walenkamp
Lodewijk W van Rhijn