

19 July 2001

Mr C Wheeler
Editor, AJPM
Australasian Podiatry Council
41 derby St
Collingwood, Vic

Dear Chris

Re: Evaluation of a weightbearing neutral position casting device

Thank you for the helpful reviewer's comments. Enclosed is the revised manuscript and our response to the comments:

General Comments:

It is difficult to provide any more detail than what we have done regarding the FAS device itself. We are bound by confidentiality requirements from the developer of the device. I presume the reviewer was sent a photocopy of the black and white photos of the device. Is the original photo I sent you clear enough? I have changes and added some words in the description of the device, which may make it clearer.

We have also added a footnote regarding our lack of financial interest in the FAS

Response to points:

1) I will leave it to your discretion regarding changing the title to "*Preliminary Evaluation...*". To me 'Preliminary' or 'Pilot' a title implies that follow-up research is to be done. While further research on/with the FAS is warranted, we have no plans to do it, so our project was the first and final evaluation we are doing. I will leave it up to you to decide. We have, however, added the word 'preliminary' in a couple of places in the text and in the conclusion.

2) Changed

3) The reference is still 'in press' – it is in Volume 18 (August) – we just do not have page numbers – we will have them in time for publication in AJPM, if you accept the paper.

4) Changed

5) Changed

6) Reference deleted

7) Changed

8) See above

9) Yes. Sentence added

10) Changed

11) Changed

12) Details added.

13) Changed. More details added.

14) Changed

15) I am not sure what the reviewer is saying here, The 'central limit theorem' is the reason for using the average of two. The ICC of the two measurements in the results section of 0.88 for intertester suggest that the value obtained by the two clinicians are close together and can not be as wide as what the reviewer is using it the example. In our previous study (Chuter et al), we used the average of 3 clinicians and that use of the 3rd did not add any greater information. Is not adding in the values obtained by each clinician unnecessary detail? I will add it if you think we should.

16) Changed. Data reanalysed using the Wilcoxon.

17) Added in info on experience

18) Added in detail on subjects.

19) The word 'digital' was added. We did not investigate the accuracy, but assume that they were very accurate.

20) Detail added

21) Changed

22) Bar graph added – fig 2

23) It was at all 3 points – text has been changed

24) Bar graph added – fig 3

25) It was at all 3 points together – text changed

26) Changed

27) Changed

28) We have add a paragraph on the limitation of the study and a sentence earlier in the description of the device about length of time for casting

29) The last paragraph of the discussion discusses the clinical relevance, but we have added a couple of sentences regarding the practical implications as raised by the reviewer.

I hope these changes are satisfactory. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any further questions.

Kind regards

Craig Payne
Lecturer