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Reviewer’s report:

This is an enjoyable piece of exploratory research. It very much has the feel of being written with a bias to promote paediatric aspects of podiatry within the undergraduate curriculum. It is very descriptive and deals primarily with the "what". I accept it is exploratory in nature, but there is no recognition or recommendation for future studies to explore why there is such differentiation between Australian institutions and the others who participated.

Comments from text:

Abstract - reads nicely, and succinctly covers main points. Noted that the conclusion of the abstract is actually larger than the conclusion in the main text.

Introduction - page 5 lines 1 - 50: In general there are some big statements which are un-referenced within this section, giving it almost an editorial feel.

Lines 12 - 15: Statement that paediatric podiatry is a specialist domain of the profession. As there is no reference, could this be interpreted as bias from the authors?

Lines 27 - 32. Statement made that entry level programmes provide core knowledge, skills and abilities for paediatric practice. The next sentence states there should be an "introduction to core paediatric skill...." Why should the programme provide an "introduction to core" " when "core knowledge is required"?

Lines 42 - 44: Statement re curriculum content being heavily influenced by the professional body. UK HEI's have to satisfy statutory and regulatory body (SRB) scrutiny that entry to the profession meets minimum standards. Should this be recognised here? Are professional body and SRB requirements the same across all countries within this study?

Page 5 lines 12 - 14: Statement made that there is "no such evidence within the podiatry context". This is slightly ambiguous. Does it mean that research has been conducted with no evidence to support, or does it mean that there is no evidence because no research has been undertaken?

Survey Development, page 6 lines 12 - 38: How valid and reliable is the survey tool? What steps were taken to minimise bias within the survey? Possibly need to look at recognising this within the "limitations of the study" section.
Participants, page 6, line 45 - page 7, line 3: How were the representatives selected? Was university contacted via consistent means? Was it a random contact? Given the discrepancy that arises later in the response rates between Australia and UK institutions, think this possibly needs a little more scrutiny.

Data management and analysis, page 7, lines 52 - 57: Sentence beginning "For example...." does not add anything to the explanation, and removal should be considered.

Page 9, lines 1 - 5: some minor grammatical issues, with capital letters where not required. Do not thin the parenthesis giving the example adds to text, and should be considered for removal.

Discussion in general is descriptive rather than giving critical insights. Perhaps asking the question "why" there is such a difference between the 5 - 10 hours in UK as opposed to 26 in Australia may be useful. What evidence is there that the 26 hours delivered in Australia is sufficient, or that the 5 -10 hours in UK is insufficient? That said, acknowledgement is made that is this is an exploratory study, and I accept that gaining these type of insights may sit outwith the objectives of the authors.

There are occasions throughout the text when the writing moves from first person to third person, and then back to third person. Is this deliberate? My preference would be to see this written in 3rd person - but only a preference, not necessarily a recommendation.
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