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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you to the authors for submitting this well presented and very interesting article that will update the historical published knowledge about current foot orthoses prescribing habits of podiatrists for people with RA. I have only a few minor suggestions for amends if the authors would kindly consider them. They are outlined below in page, section and line order:

Background section, line 12-14- final sentence: could the aim of the study also reflect the purpose of describing the current prescribing habits in respect of health service provider benchmarking and potential influence of the results to inform future research of FO (pre-fab and customised) for people with RA.

Methods section, 2nd paragraph- survey design - can it be clarified if how the survey questions were developed is provided in the fuller survey (reference number 30)? and if this detail is not given within reference 30, is it possible to provide it here?

Results section - 1st paragraph- demographics - although the discussion has acknowledged the relatively low response rate- do the authors have a figure for the number of podiatrists that could have potentially completed the survey across the UK, Australia and New Zealand?

Discussion section, 3rd paragraph, final sentence - can it be clarified if the lack of consensus outline about type of functional FO is cross all 3 countries, just one or two?

4th paragraph, reference for 1st sentence - should this reference be number 31? not number 30? - there may be some numbering issues with the references from this point forwards as some of them don't seem to align with the point being made- can this be checked?

Discussion section, 6th paragraph - Line 18 -can it be made clear the study by Nester et al was in the UK only not across any other countries.

9th paragraph - Line 20/21 - to what extent was the survey rate lower than expected? can this be clarified? (Same point as per comment for results section). End of 9th paragraph - was the survey piloted within each country separately? if this is explained in the earlier publication (reference number 30) - can this be made clear?

Discussion section, 10th paragraph - line 11 - can it be clarified how many participants provided free text comments out of the total number of survey participants, how this free text data was
analysed and by whom and how strongly (or not) it supports/aligns with the quantitative results of the survey.

Thank you.
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