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**Reviewer's report:**

Thank-you for the opportunity to review this manuscript which sought to determine the clinical knowledge and practice of Australian podiatrists on children with developmental coordination disorder. Generally the methodology and the results obtained appear to support the conclusions drawn and, since the evidence base in relation podiatry and DCD is limited there will be benefits of this work progressing to publication. However consideration of a number points is warranted before this.

Abstract

Lines 29 -39 Although the aim of the study is understood the reviewer asks that it is slightly rephrased in the abstract to improve its clarity.

Line 30 change "it's" to its

Line 55 "we" consider avoiding 1st person narrative in scientific write up.

Background

The background is generally clear as to the purpose of the study with appropriate references. However I did expect to see the following work that had considered DCD from the ICF-CY perspective,


I would also think the introduction may benefit from inclusion of the retrospective podiatric study by Hindmoor.


Line 93 94,

"Inclusion of other allied health professionals, such as podiatrists, in management of DCD symptomology is an emerging and relevant field."

Is this statement corroborated in the literature or the opinion of the Authors?

Line 101 line 103

"It is within scope of practice for podiatrists to have the ability to appropriately assess and manage the lower limb concerns of a child with DCD, and to understand when referral is appropriate."

Rather an assumptive statement the reviewer suggests further qualifying this statement or corroborating with appropriate citation.

Line 106 "in the general podiatric population"

Should this not read amongst podiatrists in Australia?

Line 108 The primary aim reads somewhat ambiguously and requires greater specificity.

Methods

Line 142 -143

Please elaborate how measures of clinical knowledge and experience of DCD were further developed by the authors or allude to where this is discussed in the methodology section.

Discussion

Line 319 -320 "great amount of caution" consider tempering your statement here, The work the Authors are alluding to only considered 14 subjects and Morrison et al acknowledge it was only a preliminary study which may have been underpowered.
Although the authors have performed a power calculation and met the minimum required number of respondents, further discussion on the risks of participation bias in surveys needs to be considered in the limitations since only 7% of eligible podiatrists responded. It may have been interesting to see if there was any bias in the sample in terms of years of qualification, primary role, highest qualification, and paediatric patient load in the responders compared to the overall national demographics published by the Podiatry Board of Australia.

Did the authors wish to allude how this work may or may not be generalisable to international podiatry given the recent work by Williams et al on undergraduate paediatric education?
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