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Reviewer's report:

I would like to thank the authors for their detailed and considered response to the original reviews, they have done an excellent job in revising their paper accordingly.

The justification around sample size offered by the authors is reasonable and as highlighted, is not unusual for motion analysis research. The approach to statistical analysis is also fitting. Given the amount and nature of data generated, it is difficult to avoid some of the challenges that such a large amount of data brings.

I offer a couple of very minor discretionary revisions below, however overall find this research to be interesting, practically relevant and very well conducted.

Abstract, conclusions: Please clarify what ‘result critical’ refers to in practical terms?

Background - lines 96 and 98: To enhance readability, consider re-phrasing to avoid double use of the word 'while' at the start of these sentences.

Methods - line 153: It may be worth pointing out that the intervention shoe was only worn on one foot, with a control shoe on the other side, to mimic clinical use (if this was the case?). This is at the authors discretion however it may not be immediately obvious to some readers why the intervention shoes were not tested bilaterally.

Statistics – line 197: should this say paired (two) or corresponding (equivalent)?

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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