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Reviewer's report:

I would like to thank the authors for their further consideration of my comments. I can see some response to these and appreciate the time taken. Whilst I don't agree with a number of the responses, I think it is evident that we have different perspectives on this topic (and the approach undertaken). Nevertheless, I think the article is within the scope of the journal and readers will find interest in this work, despite their reluctance to offer some clinical recommendations/highlights. My concerns about aspects of the currency/relevance of the work remain but publication will help support some further debate and scrutiny of the topic.

There are some final points for consideration:

1. Line 44 - review the phrase mechanical supportive aids. Would assistive devices be appropriate?

2. Line 46 - 47 - review the accuracy of this statement. This is suggesting that footwear is solely responsible for mitigating ground reaction forces during gait.

3. The statement that footwear has been considered a mobility aid for children cites two dated sources. Is this still a common view? Some context would be useful.

4. Line 52. Please review the accuracy of reference 9 (Adolph et al) to support your argument. This study compared the contributions of growing body dimensions, age, and walking experience.

5. As requested previously, clearer alignment with the PRISMA-ScR within the manuscript is warranted to help ensure robustness of the process. For example, was any of the review paperwork calibrated? What does the iterative process mean? When was the last search undertaken? You might also want to add a statement about the levels of evidence incorporated into your review.
6. There still needs to be consideration (and addition) of the limitations of the scoping review. For example, the process of screening and review adopted by the authors. Disclosure of limitations is also within the PRISMA-ScR guidelines.

7. Lines 224-225 (and where appropriate). Review the accuracy of your terms. Pes planus and genu valgum are not examples of "structural congenital conditions". The review needs to be careful to avoid repetition of dated terminology and / or perspectives. The application of references here is dubious and further challenges the relevance of the outcomes. Careful review of these is warranted.
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