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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

The authors have addressed most of the issues that I raised previously, although I believe certain issues could be made clearer to the reader:

1. The aim of the paper is not addressed in the background section. Would the authors consider making the aim of this study clearer in the final paragraph of the background section? In addition, the manner in which the aim is stated throughout the manuscript (and following comments made by the authors) is a little confusing. For example, the aim appears to have been stated in three different ways, each with subtle variations:

- “To investigate the distribution of corns and their association with pain, foot related disability and quality of life…”

- “To determine if the presence of corns was associated with pain, foot disability and affected quality of life (QoL)”

- “To analyse the relationship between demographic factors (age, sex) and corn parameters (size, type); and foot-related disability outcomes”

2. Further to my first review, the Discussion section never reflected on the results relating to the association between corn parameters and foot related disability outcomes – it is not until the conclusion that the aim of the study was discussed. Given that the aim of this study appears to have investigated the association of pain, foot disability and QoL with corns, I believe an explanation for the findings (relating to corns) needs to be addressed.

As such, could the authors elaborate and provide an explanation for why they believe there was no significant association between corn type and a linear combination of the outcome measures; no significant association between corn size and a linear combination of the outcome measures; and why participants with dorsal/interdigital corns scored higher on the QoL scale than patients with plantar corns?
3. I don’t believe the heading for table 2 is self-explanatory. Would the authors consider revising the heading to make it clearer for the reader?

4. Figure 1: 4th med head should be 4th met head

5. Figure 1: participants is spelt incorrectly

6. Please review the referencing style recommended for JFAR. There are issues with most references in regards to location of full stops, commas, abbreviation of journals (some are abbreviated and some are not) and spacing. Go to: http://www.jfootankleres.com/authors/instructions/research#formatting-references

**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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