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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?
   Overall, this is a timely, important and well focussed study on an area of podiatry practice that is in need of change and improvement. Suggestions for consideration:
   The use of the word 'habits' is one that I was not sure about, but on reflection it is an appropriate term. I'm not sure if the term 'screening' should be replaced with the word 'assessmen'. There is too scant mention of the concept of 'diagnosis' - it could do with being emphasised more as a key issue, relating to potential cardiovascular and limb outcomes - early death and amputation. There could be more discussion of the importance of subjective and objective assessment identifying presence / absence of PAD and the level of severity, which will guide podiatrists in their onward care / referrals - eg cardiovascular risk management vs limb protection.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?
   Yes

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?
   Not sure - not my area of expertise - involve an academic reviewer.

4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation?
   Yes

5. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Not sure. As above.

6. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes, but see my initial comments above to consider balance and perspective. I don't think more podiatry specific guidelines are needed per se. Podiatry summary of existing widely respected national & internation PAD Guidelines might be better use of further study / development time and resources.

7. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   Yes
8. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes - clear and focussed. I enjoyed the read and look forward to citing it when published.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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