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Reviewer's report:

Comments

Line 74/75 - I think the punctuation / flow needs checking here

Lines 79-84 appear to be a repeat x 3 - so needs checking

The content of these lines too I feel would be open to challenge - an expert, I feel, is not someone who has undertaken something once in the past year. This when published may result in comments from others that the validity of these findings could be questioned. I am sure that those who are involved in this have done considerably more than one in the past year but this is still a concern - I will leave it to the author to consider this comment

Line 179-180 - Range of 5 - 14 years with a mean of 19.5 - unless I am reading this wrong it does not make sense ? - I also anticipate the total end range was much higher if there are consultants involved in this research (orthopaedic / podiatric surgery for example)

Line 237 - "why for those working in surgical teams" ? - Access under POMS for podiatrists mean that LA and Steroid (Depo-Medrone) is available to all who have this qualification. Therefore they do not need to be in 'surgical teams' There may be some restrictions for non-medics and non-pods who have not got IP for example when accessing the POMS but the suggestion that this needs to be in surgical teams is somewhat restricting and also not appreciating the actual scope of podiatry today - I would consider changing it
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