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Reviewer's report:

A survey to investigate the association of pain, foot disability and quality of life with corns

Major Compulsory Revisions

Abstract

The authors highlighted in the Abstract that corns are associated with a degree of pain and can affect mobility and quality of life. However, in the results section corn type, corn location and corn size was not significantly associated with a combination of outcome measures or individual subscale items. Have the authors overstated the results?

Method

I'm not sure about the statement “Lower VAS pain scores represent better functionality”. Lower VAS pain scores simply represent less pain and cannot be associated with function (unless it is statistically evaluated).

The independent variables are clearly identified (and labeled as such), although it might be useful to the reader if the authors specifically state the dependent variable (I assume it is the three subscales of the MFPDI).

Could the authors make it clearer what scale of measurement was used to report corn size?

I would suggest the authors present the minimum and maximum scores of the MFPDI.

Was a p value less than 0.05 considered statistically significant?

Results

The aim of the study was to evaluate the association between the presence of corns with foot pain, foot disability and quality of life, although the results appeared to focus more on the association between other independent variables (i.e. age, gender) and the outcome measures. Would the authors consider beginning the results section by immediately highlighting the association between corn type, corn size and corn location with the outcome measure? In addition, the entire discussion section did not once mention the lack of any significant association between corn type, corn size and corn location but rather focused on
other (secondary) associations.

Would it be possible for the authors to present some of the results in table format? For example, it might be useful to the reader if the individual contribution of each independent variable, to the final model, is reported.

Discretionary Revisions

Introduction

The opening paragraph of the introduction is too long and loses focus. I would suggest that the authors concentrate on those studies that reported foot pain and the presence of corns/callouses. The paragraph probably does not require citation 7 or 8, which draws attention away from the purpose of the study.

I would suggest the authors make the aim of the study clearer in the final sentences of the introduction and consider justifying why this study is important. The target audience of this journal is aware that corns can impact on foot health related quality of life, so I would recommend telling the reader why this study is needed.

Method

The opening sentence of the Methods is too long and awkward. I would suggest the authors consider revising this sentence.

Could the authors explain why a multivariate analysis was not conducted to evaluate the association between corn size, type, location (after controlling for age and gender) with pain measured using the VAS and quality of life using the EQ-5D?

**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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