Reviewer’s report

Title: Symptomatic pes planus in children: a synthesis of allied health professional practices.

Version: 0 Date: 31 Oct 2019

Reviewer: Angela Evans AM

Reviewer's report:

Thank you for your submission and the work and effort to do so are appreciated.

I am sorry that I have to disappoint the authors in this instance as this exploration, whilst an interesting extension of Kane’s 2015 study, is based on a small and limited sample, such that meaningful conclusions beyond perhaps preliminary trends, are not reasonable.

Further, it should be noted that Kane's study, from which this survey was drawn, was directed at a small number of physical therapists who cared for children with delayed gross motor development and neurological conditions.

Overall issues, which have largely been conveyed, and which limit further, meaningful conclusions include:

- small sample n = 55, drawn from non-defined population size
- low response rate
- differing and disparate sub groups (n=6; 16; 33) with differing experience levels and case loads
- cross sectional survey data
- broad, varying descriptive for 'symptomatic' cases (ie no differentiation of foot pain, functional impairment, proximal joint problems, reduced quality of life)

In essence, it is likely 'drawing a long bow' to conclude practice inconsistencies (or any form of conclusion) given the small and limited sampling, wide definitions of symptomatic, disparate sub groups.
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