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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

We thank you and the reviewers for their input on this manuscript and the recommendation of minor revision. As recommended, we have provided a clean version of the manuscript without tracked changes at this stage.

Reviewer 1:

Comment: I appreciate you have changed the title to reflect my comments. However, I am not sure about the title. You might want to consider this again?

Response: We have thought about the title as suggested. The current title gives the study name and acronym, which is useful for readers in situating the work. It provides information about the key exposures and outcomes, and also clearly states what method is used. Therefore, we think it provides everything the reader requires.

Comment: Same applies to the conclusion section

Response: We have reviewed the conclusion section and believe it accurately reflects our work and brings it to a conclusion. If more specific suggestions are provided, we can consider them.

Reviewer 3:

Comment: Thank you to the authors for their extensive responses and rewrite of the manuscript. It has greatly improved the logic and flow. I also believe these changes have dramatically changed the tone of the article as well.
Response: We thank the reviewer for her positive comments

Comment: I understand the challenge on risk of bias assessment with the inclusion of the types of papers. While I still believe that it should and could be done, I accept the authors response. In light of this though, no assessment of bias/quality should be stated as a limitation within the article. That narrative review and non-ability to undertake a meta-analysis and assessment of quality of articles may lead to the authors inadvertently over or understating the results of included manuscripts. This is an important statement to let the reader know they need to consider their own bias when reading the article.

Response: We agree. This information was stated in the methods section, but we have now added it to the limitations section in the discussion as well (Ln 397-400)

Comment: I agree that being children into the discussion is valuable however still have issues with the wording. We make things adult only due to risk but also developmental status. The growth plates of the foot close by 16 in females, 17 in males. Some countries allow 16 year olds to drive, 18 year olds to drink but is 18 to drive and 21 to drink in other countries. Placing an age doesn't help the article. I would encourage the authors to consider instead: Moreover, it may be worthwhile considering whether it is appropriate that high heels can be sold to and for the wear of people who are still skeletally immature.

Response: We have made the requested change using the suggested phrasing from the reviewer (Ln 367).

Comment: Additionally, a few minor language/grammar considerations.

Response: We have responded to each point below

Comment: Ln 139 - Please reference the review discussed

Response: Ln 139 – ‘our review’ refers to the current manuscript. We think this is clear from the preceding sentences.

Comment: Ln 171-172 - review of reviews should also be review of reviews and additions primary studies

Response: Ln 171-172 is in the inclusion criteria section and we cannot find the phrase the reviewer refers to.

Comment: Ln 283 - Reference required

Response: We had given the citation numbers for the case reports earlier in the results section, but now have repeated this information as requested by the reviewer (Ln 283)

Comment: Ln 323, 327, 343, - Spell out ED as emergency department. This is a different abbreviation in many countries so keep it as full text.
Response: We have made the suggested change

Additionally, we have read through the manuscript again and would like to make the following minor changes, which we have implemented in this revision:

- Ln 15, correspondence email. Dr Barnish leaves the University of Aberdeen on 30 June 2017. So, we have put his personal email address for the time being, although at the proofs stage, he is likely to have a new institutional email address available that can be put on the published paper

- Ln 356, change ‘outwith’ to ‘beyond’ – we realised that ‘outwith’, while standard use in Scotland, is not well understood by English speakers elsewhere. We hope that ‘beyond’ conveys the meaning almost as well and will reach a broader audience effectively, although to a Scottish audience it sounds a bit awkward

- Ln 429, S. Fields who is acknowledged has changed her surname to Reynolds during the period this manuscript has been under review, and we have updated this accordingly

We thank the Editor and Reviewers for their time and work in reviewing this manuscript and offering suggestions for its improvement. We hope that it will now meet with the Editor’s approval

Dr Maxwell Barnish, on behalf of the authors