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Reviewer's report:

The authors made a study on the current use of techniques for hallux valgus and rigidus surgery in Switzerland. The study merits publication after "major compulsory revision". I would be willing to rereview the revision. The study is interesting but I leave it to the Editor to decide if this study fits the journals scope also for the international readers. As I am Swiss I find the study very interesting but I may be biassed.

Here my comments:

Abstract:
- Background: The authors list 5 influences in line 52-53. However these influences are not reported neither in the Results nor Conclusions. Could you please summarize if your question (the 5 factors) has been rejected/confirmed.
- line 60: should be... for 3 separate cases of (1) moderate and (2) severe hallux valgus and (3) hallux rigidus.
- line 62: the survey was just answered by 230 patients. the reporting of the 322 respondents is misleading (see your own tabs 2-4).
- Conclusions: Please answer what do the 5 influence factors lead to.

Background:
- line 101: Please tell the reader, how the influences changed practice towards what.

Methods:
- Please put your whole questionnaire into an Appendix or as a Graph. This would facilitate the understanding of your study.

Results:
- line 254: In Tab 2-4 you mention 230 patients, here only 229. Please clarify.
- line 156 ff is identical to 153 ff. Please delete.
- Please clearly state, that you only had 230 answers as in Tab 2-4 your analysis is only made with 230 patients. The 322 respondents are misleading. Also your response rate is then smaller: only 35%.
- The low response rate has to be discussed as a limitation. Only one third is a weakness of this study to represent really the management of hallux surgery.
- line 164-5: What does the "It" and "most" refer to (Chevron, Scarf, McBride) as this is a repetition of line 163.

Discussion
- I recommend an electronic check of the Reference 8 (Australian-Study) with this document to avoid identical sentences (e.g. in Discussion and Results).
- Please list your Limitations (35% response rate, Swiss more local review.....)
- Please discuss the difference of the current study with the findings of the Australian study in the 5 stated influence factors. What do you conclude out of this.
- line 209-228 rather belongs to the Results. The results are very shortly written anyway.
- line 239-242 the same
- Please make more a comparision of your current results with the literature other than reference 8 and other than repeating the results.

Conclusion
- Instead of repeating the Introduction, please state what you really found (what does an influence factor lead to).

Tabs:
- Please create the same style of tabs as in reference 8 Tab 1-3. This would make the results much better understandable for the reader.
- Tab: 2: Revel please change to Revel
- Tab. 2-4: please list under "other" what the other procedures were. Did you also record minimally invasive surgery, proximal open wedge osteotomies, crescentic osteotomies?
- Tab. 5: Please list what you compared exactly: language French/German versus which procedure in case 1-3 ?
- Tab: 5 report p-values e.g. p<0.001 instead of 7.37e-11 or 0.00063..... Also report just 2-3 decimals.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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.
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