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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor

Re – Revised Review paper following reviewer’s comments - The Changing landscape of professional practice in podiatry, lessons to be learned from other professions about the barriers to change – a narrative review

The work in the paper submitted was previously reviewed for JAFR and rejected under the above title. However, we reflected on the reviewer’s comments and have made revisions in response to the reviewers constructive and developmental feedback.

We therefore hope that our revisions have appropriately addressed the points raised.

Please see below our responses to the reviewer’s feedback

1. Rephrase a couple of assertions that may be mistaken for personal opinion, as readers can sometimes be harsher critics than we would wish (there are two points I have referred to above)

   a) "It is this evolution that should be driving change…",

   b) "these responses should not be an approach of taking from one area to give to another”.

   a) rephrased as ‘As change is now a constant this gives clinicians the opportunity to take ownership to drive that change forward’. 
b) This point has been removed from the manuscript. The paragraphs previous to it have been rephrased to put them into context as per reviewer feedback. This statement therefore no longer plays a part in concluding the discussion.

2. Clarify in the method section if this is a literature review alone or a documentary analysis with a thematic analysis of the derived data.

To clarify the purpose of this piece of work was to create a narrative review based upon the global findings from the literature and this has been reflected in the methods section.

3. Consider widening the literature to include material from sociology or other sources in podiatry that may have been missed (possibly because the British Journal of Podiatry is more or less a grey literature source). Use of sociological literature might have been missed through the search terms used, but I'm not sure. Obviously, this might be a really difficult request to meet, given that you have already undertaken the review, so I would not insist on it, but it might be worth bearing in mind in future.

I am agreement this would be difficult to achieve as the review has already been done. I had not ignored the sociological literature in this paper, however I felt that this discussion was better suited to a chapter in my PhD (which this publication is part of) when I bring all of my work together, rather than trying to fit too much content into the submitted paper.

4. Identify any relevant legislative or policy context in the different countries from which studies are drawn, as this can be relevant to the veracity of any overall conclusions.

I have discussed this point in the limitations, stating that differing systems and legislative structures mean that we have to be cautious around a direct transfer of change knowledge from a culture different from our own.

5. Consider whether or not the use of theory/ or an overarching framework would be helpful in bringing the paper together more clearly.

I have introduced Lewins framework in the background to demonstrate the transitional phases required to change. This also then provides foundation to understand why barriers to change early in the process, no matter from which sources, practitioner, patient or organisation can impact strongly on whether the change process can begin or not. This theoretical background has been revisited in a summary at the end of the review just before the conclusion to clearly demonstrate the impact of barriers to change early in the change process.

6. Address the typographical errors.
P16, line 29: "Impetuous" should be "impetus"

P 19, para 3: there is a change in font halfway through it.

There are some repeat references: eg. Reference 16 is also reference 91.

P13-14: The "Health Care Professions Council" should be the "Health and Care Professions Council"

P 2, line 57: "the Podiatry profession" should be "the podiatry profession" (i.e. In lower case). All errors corrected

7. MDT working

Section in page 12 regarding MDT working has been rewritten to show a more balanced view around the role of MDT working and professional autonomy, to include Simon Carmels work. Can I thank the reviewer for highlighting this work as it was a useful and enjoyable read. YES

8. The role of evidence as a barrier to change

Section in page 14 has been rewritten to highlight how practitioner’s perception of research evidence can be a negative one. This lack of engagement can therefore prevent change from happening. Evidence has also been provided to support the adoption of guidelines as a further barrier to changing practice.

We believe the paper has strong merits for publication in JFAR, is the fourth part of work already published in JFAR, and that we have reflected and benefitted from the reviewer’s feedback.

Yours Faithfully,

Michael Harrison-Blount
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