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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for this very interesting paper. This is clearly an under researched area and podiatry services need this information in order to justify service development for people with SLE.

Over all the paper is well written and both the method and the results are clearly articulated. The discussion creates a good reflection on the work and aligns it with the work of others in the same field.

There are some corrections that I think would enhance the quality and impact of the paper.

Although it is clear in the methods that the work was carried out in New Zealand I recommend that this is added to the title.

Page 5 line 36 - 40 perhaps the questionaire can be added as an additonal file rather than the URL being in the text.

Page 7 line 2 VSS requires a reference and /or an explanation as to what it is.

Page 7 line 45 - add in what the three categories are.

Page 10 Line 14 - 21 - The work adds to previous survey work so be clear here how it adds. Perhaps compare and contrast with the previously published work. I think the emphasis on problems associated with the condition itself are covered well. Perhaps some commentary/message about how common foot problems may be problematic given the autoimmune nature of the condition. Planned future research is usually communicated as something that is needed rather than what the authors are planning to do. In this respect the last two sentences need revising to reflect that.

Figures 1 and 2 need labelling and some explanation as to how the reader is to interpret them.
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