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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review the following survey study  Assessment and management of symptomatic pes planus in children:  a synthesis of allied health professional practices. The premise of the study is of interest to this publication.

The methodology of the survey appears sound as the aims and objectives are clearly defined as is the population of interest, and a systematic approach was used to develop the questionnaire and domains within, with appropriate piloting of the survey tool used. The results generated and conclusions drawn could therefore be considered sound.

However; there are some points that if addressed I feel would improve this paper prior to publication.

Background

This is well written with supportive references,

Some minor comments

Line 56 Is Flexible Pes Planus completely non osseous there may be skeletal dimorphism that may account for this e.g. Accessory bones, Articular facets (Kothari, Bhuva, Stebbins, Zavatsky, &amp; Theologis, 2016)
"The flexible variant can be further characterised as asymptomatic (often referred to as physiological) or symptomatic (from either idiopathic or non-idiopathic aetiology)."

I feel a citation here to support this statement is required.

"however current opinion supports intervention for symptomatic presentations only [4, 6]."

I was surprised that the more modern Dars 2018 Delphi Survey was not also used here to back up this statement since you reference this earlier in the background.

Methods

Was an a priori sample size calculated or theorised for the survey?

I would suggest adding the modified survey to enable the reader to assess the quality of it and ensure no ambiguous or biased terminology was used.

Further elaboration is required as to how the Authors categorised the data what type of synthesis was used how was this validated how were disagreements resolved?
I am uncertain what was the purpose and validity of analysing these two questions in this way with respect to the other data generated in the survey. Please state for the reader which questions these were.

Results

There appears to be a rather low completion rate for this study however you do clearly state this as a limiting factor and the affect this may have on external validity.

Line 161 please review sentence "and 3 had roles where 75 - 99% of their caseload paediatric foot."

I feel further graphical or table representation is required to showcase your results there are a number of results not presented in the tables given.

The Demographics section was somewhat confusing to see the overall data a table here would support your discussion.

Assessment

Further breakdown of the types of neurological assessment performed by the sample may be useful (Motor, Sensory)

Intervention

Line 206-213

In relation to professional use of prefabricated orthosis I could not find this data in your table, the odds ratio of this may have been interesting to read.
Line 213-216 I assume this is categorical / qualitative data I think this is interesting and again I feel it would be better showcased in table form.

Line 216-221 Was there any discrepancy here by profession again a breakdown on the data in table form may help clarify this.

Discussion

I was surprised not to see this recent paper in your work (Gijon-Nogueron, Martinez-Nova, Alfageme-Garcia, Montes-Alguacil, &amp; Evans, 2019) in relation to discussion on possible criteria for assessment of pes planus.

References


Level of interest
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

'I declare that I have no competing interests'

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal