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Reviewer's report:

Thank-you to the authors for their resubmission of this manuscript. There has been some consideration of the comments from the initial review and I can see some clarification within the text. I'd like to propose that the authors take some time to consider a few further points listed below. There is some repetition as these pick up on some of the issues from the first review. I have struggled to fully appreciate the process and the outcomes from the scoping activity and ask the authors for a further, careful consideration of the manuscript.

I appreciate that the title has been adjusted in response to reviewer 2 but it seems that the review expands beyond therapeutic footwear (as also indicated within the background). Are the authors confident the title accurately reflects their study?

It was requested that the background more closely aligned with the intention of the scoping review. The focus of the study is therapeutic footwear but there is little consideration of this in the introduction. There needs to be clearer alignment between the intention of the scoping review and the rationale for doing this work. I think it would be useful to ensure that the application of therapeutic footwear is clear - how does this this apply to children with flat feet (lines 66 - 69)? What aids walking and limb development? It would be prudent to ensure that the applications of therapeutic footwear are consistent (e.g. again, is this the case for pes planus) and credible. This needs to apply through the review. There should be some attempt to define therapeutic footwear earlier to avoid confusion and mis-interpretation.

Is pes planus a mobility disorder (line 256)? The credibility of the clinical application is important, and this picks up on my previous comment about the historical perspective represented in the scoping review. The historical perspective weakens the currency of the findings (as briefly indicated by the authors within the manuscript). For example, are navicular cookies (I have never used this phrase or heard this phrase used) still a common intervention? Are approaches for toe walking (from 1988) still relevant? I appreciate that the authors want to include this historical perspective but there needs to be some consideration of the impact. If the aim of the scoping review was a historic perspective of treatment interventions, then I could well appreciate the inclusion of these studies. Clarification would be useful.
If the authors are intending to cover 'all aspects' of childhood development, there should be some consideration of this within the text. What does it mean and are the authors confident that footwear indicated for all these purposes?

Line 111 child development/health are not inter-changeable.

Line 150 Please clarify what the charting process and topical research groups means. How were these groups formed?

Justification for the addition of literature where footwear is an adjunct to foot orthoses would be useful. It could be argued that this skews the focus of the scoping activity.

It is not clear if full-text of the submissions considered...or just abstracts. Please clarify.

It is still not clear what the n refer to. Are these the number of studies? For example, the protective role of footwear (lines 312) has n=30 for infection. What is this for? There are 4 studies cited.
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