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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting piece of work that highlights the importance of understanding the challenges and barriers for people obtaining appropriate footwear when they have chronic disease. The study aim aligns itself nicely to a qualitative research approach. However, the overall qualitative paradigm and methods section requires further detail and clarity. Within the methods section the authors state that a descriptive methodology was used as the underpinning philosophy. The reference used [7] to support this research approach does not align with the approach taken and is in itself a research study that focused on a Nominal Group Technique. Typically descriptive methodology primarily focuses on the "what" of the research subject rather than the "why" of the research subject which seems somewhat at odds with the aim of the study to explore in-depth personal experiences. Within a descriptive approach while qualitative methods can be used this is generally undertaken through observation, case studies or surveys because this type of research generally describes a set of observations or the data collected rather than drawing conclusions from the data about why individuals have specific opinions or perceptions. The latter aligns better with a more interpretative paradigm. There is little information provided on how this research approach was chosen to answer the research question. There is also limited information on how the comparative thematic analysis was undertaken with the information provided by the authors more aligned to an inductive thematic analysis. I would suggest in order to strengthen the methods section of this paper the authors revise the underlying paradigm to ensure there is close alignment with the aim of the study to the philosophical approach taken. Maybe consider re-framing the manuscript to more of an interpretative paradigm which aligns to the stated aim of the study. But if they chose to do this, the results section would also need careful modified to demonstrate a more interpretative approach where there is clear interpretation of the data and direct excerpts from the participant voices are used to support the authors interpretation and then further unpacked to generate a deeper meaning behind what the participant is indicating. Currently within the results section there doesn't seem to be a deep, rich or thick interpretation of the meaning of the themes which is usually expected in an interpretative paradigm. Also in this approach there wouldn't be multiple excerpts to support the same point which is noted on page 6 or page 8 but rather there is greater discussion or interpretation around one excerpt that represents the point being made. However, if the authors believe that a descriptive methodology is what they prefer to present, then consideration to changing the aim of the study needs to undertaken and I would suggest more detailed explanation and information regarding the methodological approach from primary
methodology texts would be useful. Once greater detail is provided on the methodological approach the authors would need to ensure that the results section strongly aligns with their chose approach. I would suggest reviewing the following references as a guide to support strengthening this manuscript:
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