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Thank you for your preparation of this manuscript.

Abstract
The results section requires the inclusion of statistical results particularly as you report the 3D scanning methodology has higher precision, repeatability, these statements need to be quantified.

Background
This section requires restructure as there are numerous grammatical and typographical errors. I feel the section does present a sufficient background to the study however due to the grammatical errors the section does not seem to have a logical flow.

Methods
There is no reference to ethical approval. Was this study approved by the ethics committee of the institution? I found this section difficult to follow and would find reproducing the study on the current description difficult. I would also be interested as to why only the dominant foot was chosen for investigation. It would have been good to have bilateral data form comparison. I would also like to have seen correct medical terminology used, for example the plantar surface of the foot is referred to as the bottom of the foot. I would also like to have seen some statistical information regarding repeatability. You stated in the conclusion that the 3D scanner data was highly repeatable but have no analysis to quantify this.

Results
As above more detail surrounding repeatability would have been appropriate.

Discussion
I feel the bulk of the conclusion is a repeat of the results section. I would like to have seen a discussion of your results compared to other studies explored more. This only occurred in the last two paragraphs of the discussion.

Conclusion
The conclusion also needs to acknowledge the limitations of the population and that the subjects were non-pathological.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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