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Reviewer’s report:

This is an interesting review which has attempted to combine biomechanical and epidemiological literature with a focus on psychosexual benefits.

Your introduction section has appropriate content but I am not sure if it has a clear focus. You start off with the history then go on to talk about the dress codes in the film festivals and then about the petition to the UK parliament. All these are relevant but it is not setting the scene to the question you are trying to answer. I started reading this with interest and when I finished the introduction section, I am not sure where you want to go. I would like to see you provide clear subheadings which will improve the manuscript. Start with the historical perspective, then provide an overview of the biomechanical and clinical papers. You then need to highlight the gaps in knowledge and why are you trying to complete this review. As such I am not getting this information in a structured way.

Within the methods section you make a reference to a study (High heels). What’s this study and was it published or is this paper (which is under review) is one of the outputs? You need to make this clear.

You seem to have included overview papers - which is not an issue; but I would like to see some information on how you maintained the quality. After reviews you have added several primary publications. These seem to be from various countries - that’s OK. But were these English texts? If not did you translate them? Again how did you maintain quality? What data did you get from the meta data?

One of your aim is to provide a commentary on psychosexual literature. This is interesting but a very few studies of questionable quality? This plus the case studies doesn't really make a systematic review?

In terms of discussion, again, it is like the introduction - you are trying to review and critically analyse some evidence which is either of low quality or non existent. This in turn turns your discussion to be descriptive.

Overall, This topic is certainly of interest and I am happy if this paper is presented as another review. I am not sure if this a structured systematic review. I would like to see a clear conclusion and directions for other authors. This is missing from the main text. You do have one within the abstract but I am not sure about the conclusion section of the abstract.
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