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Reviewer’s report:

This is a systematic review evaluating the current literature pertaining to foot health programs for the prevention of diabetes related foot complications in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians. The manuscript is well written, and the review has been correctly executed. The methods are clear and could be replicated based on the methods section of the paper. The conclusions drawn are reasonable and within the scope of the paper.

I have the following minor comments for the authors to consider:

Page 5 line 12 - why do the foot programs need to be 'stand alone'? why can't they sit as part of a broader, culturally sensitive diabetes service for example, or community health service? Like the program in Perth which works with Diabetes & podiatry? Do you mean a footcare-specific program? Can you please clarify? The rationale for this should be made clearer to the reader in the background section, and perhaps reconsider the wording.

Background

Line 49 - at your discretion, consider replacing "in contrast to" with "despite the".

Results

Line 41 - should this read : full text review?

Discussion

There was no discussion about the quality assessment, in the results or the discussion? I see the data presented in the table - but shouldn't this be discussed?

You state that there are no national or state foot health programs for prevention of diabetes related foot complication in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians. I find this confusing because you have included 13 studies which contained some form of intervention which contained foot specific education, training or service provision.
Was it that they were not solely foot specific, but sat within another service? Or the fact that they were not assessed for effectiveness? Or was it that they were only run in a small geographical area? If it is the latter, are you suggesting that a state-wide or federally led program would be of greater effectiveness? Or that it would mean increased access? I think this needs to be made clearer to the reader.

Line 58 - client - should this be patient?

Limitations

Consider adding that there may be programs which have been run that are not published in any form, particularly if they are small scale or run by a solo practitioner in remote areas for example.

Other

Referencing style is incorrect - the numbers of references should occur prior to the full stop in the sentence, or before the comma.

Table of excluded papers is not necessary, I would remove this.

Figures and tables should be at the end of the manuscript, uploaded as separate files, not within the text.

Title is inconsistent with journal guidelines - study type should be at the end - "Where do we stand? The availability and efficacy of diabetes related foot health programs for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians: a systematic review"

The terms culturally safe, culturally secure, culturally sensitive and culturally appropriate are used. Are there subtle differences between these? If there are, that is fine, otherwise consider using one term throughout for consistency.
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