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Reviewer’s report:

This is the second review of the manuscript by Caravaggi and colleagues. First of all, the manuscript has been greatly improved. I would like to compliment the authors by the work they have done in changing the manuscript based on the comments of the three reviewers.

I have a few comments left.

Major compulsory revision:

In the conclusion (both the abstract and the body of the text), the authors state that “its use may result critical in patients with –re-existing balance problems”. This statement should not be made based on the current study. Authors indicate in reply to the comments of the reviewers that “we should not draw generalized conclusions on elderly”. The statement that is now part of the conclusion may be placed within the discussion, when context can be provided. It should not be a conclusion of this study; in that section, authors should limit themselves what they can truly conclude from these findings: the half-shoe is more effective in reducing plantar load, but at the cost of more kinematic and kinetic alterations.

Minor essential revisions:

- BW in the abstract should be spelled out
- In the results (3.2) a direction should be given in the wording. It is now described that “pedobarographic parameters in the half-shoe were significantly different”, but please describe how they differed: e.g. larger, smaller etc.
- The sentence in line 223-224 should either be part of the methods, or (preferably) removed
- Larger (line 233) should be largest (similar to sentence 236)
- Line 237-238: what was PTI in comparison to the full-outsole?
- Line 247: a word is missing after corresponding
- Acknowledgements: authors indicate in their response that Podartis was not involved in the study; this can also be stated in the acknowledgements

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

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