Reviewer’s report

Title: Age-related differences in foot mobility in individuals with patellofemoral pain

Version: 0 Date: 03 Jan 2018

Reviewer: Ian Mathieson

Reviewer's report:

Thank you for submitting this interesting paper. Overall I consider it to read well and to demonstrate focus and clarity throughout. I have a few specific comments for consideration:

The method is an interesting one in that it uses participants from 2 studies that are geographically and temporally separated. Table 1 provides details of the inclusion and exclusion criteria. In relation to this table and the methods section please consider:

- Defining the time periods during which the two studies - Brisbane and Melbourne - were conducted.

- Clarifying how the Anterior Knee Pain Scale was used in both groups. There is a difference in the text included in table 1 that relates to pain during activities that may lead to some confusion about the role of the AKPS and increased clarity would be helpful.

In addition,

- Please provide more references to illustrate the ongoing appropriateness of the approach to diagnosing PFP.

- If possible, provide information on the number of participants recruited from each source e.g. from community advertising and health professional referrals.

- Clarify if equal body weight distribution between the two feet was achieved by asking the subject to monitor this themselves or via any other means.

- Include a brief sentence to detail the nature of the visual inspection that confirmed the appropriateness of the clusters identified.

There is also scope for some development of the limitations in the discussion to refer to the potential impact of the geographical and temporal differences in data collection between the two
groups. Similarly, after acknowledging that the platform is not available to purchase commercially, it may be useful to state the role this plays and detail how the lack of availability of the platform could be overcome.

I hope these comments are useful.
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