

Author's response to reviews

Title: Is core podiatry treatment effective?

Authors:

Lisa J Farndon (lisa.farndon@ntlworld.com)

Andrew Barnes (andrew.barnes@barnsleypct.nhs.uk)

Keith Littlewood (keith.littlewood@ntlworld.com)

Justine Harle (justinelharle@bassetlaw-pct.nhs.uk)

Craig Beecroft (craig.beecroft@nottinghamshirecounty-tpct.nhs.uk)

Jaclyn Burnside (jaclyn.burnside@nottinghamshirecounty-tpct.nhs.uk)

Tracey Wheeler (tracey.wheeler@nhs.net)

Selwyn Morris (selwyn.morris@lincspct.nhs.uk)

Stephen J Walters (s.j.walters@sheffield.ac.uk)

Version: 2 Date: 17 February 2009

Author's response to reviews: see over

Podiatry Services
Jordanthorpe Health Centre
1 Dyche Close
Sheffield S8 8DJ
Tel: 0114 2371183
Fax: 0114 2371185
E-Mail: lisa.farndon@sheffieldpct.nhs.uk
Website: www.sheffield.nhs.uk/podiatry

13th February 2009

To the Editors-in-Chief,

IS CORE PODIATRY TREATMENT EFFECTIVE?

The revisions made this re-submitted paper based on one of the reviewers comments are as follows:

- Ethical approval was not required as this was an audit, this has now been stated in the paper.
- The background section has been expanded with more details given of the previous relevant studies mentioned.
- The countries mentioned as 'overseas' have been stated.
- The Podiatry Health Questionnaire as described by Macran et al has been described in more detail and separated from an actual description of this audit procedure.
- As this was an audit to represent 'real life' situations there was not a need to ensure inter-rater reliability as with a research project, this has been made more explicit in the text.
- More detail has been given to outline why the patients were advised to return the questionnaire in 2 weeks time and how we tried to ensure this time scale was adhered to.
- More details have been given of the different podiatry services which took part, their size and the type of populations they served.
- The drop-out rate of returned second questionnaires was unable to be collated, reasons have now been given for this in the text.
- More details of the results have been given in a more straightforward way, however I was unable to give the p value, at the statistician who compiled the statistics for this audit no longer has this data.
- A discussion of the magnitude of pre and post questionnaire and VAS scores has now been moved to the discussion section.

- The number of missing scores for the VAS and questionnaire compared with the original sample have been stated.
- A reference has been given for the statement regarding complex medical problems.
- More detail has been given about which statement in the PHQ are a general measure of foot health.
- Difficulties with completion of the VAS for some patients has been expanded.
- The conclusions have been strengthened as advised.
- The minor revisions regarding style and language have been altered accordingly.

I hope this is a clear explanation of the changes made to the paper in sequence with the reviewers comments.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Lisa Farndon