

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Orthopedics*

**Manuscript NO:** 84977

**Title:** Use of Orthotics with Orthotic Sandals Versus the Sole Use of Orthotics for Plantar Fasciitis: Randomised Controlled Trial

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 04168227

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** BPhy, DPhil, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Saudi Arabia

**Author's Country/Territory:** United Kingdom

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-04-13

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-06-16 05:11

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-06-16 05:24

**Review time:** 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors Thanks a lot for the opportunity you have offered me to revise the fascinating manuscript " Use of Orthotics with Orthotic Sandals Versus the Sole Use of Orthotics for Plantar Fasciitis: Randomised Controlled Trial". I thank the authors for their effort in producing this exciting manuscript. From the editing point of view, I recommend the authors to fully respect the editing requirements imposed by this scientific journal and clearly indicated in the template. More specifically, I mean: the number of words in the abstract and manuscript, the number of keywords and the way to indicate the bibliographic sources. As a significant strength, This proposal is a novelty in the field and adds information to the existing evidence in the literature produced in the field. As a major weakness, The manuscript sometimes lacks details and clarity concerning methodological steps that would help improve the understanding of the manuscript. Therefore, I have suggested some strategies to improve authors' reporting and increase the quality of their work (e.g., rationale/background, methods and discussion of the manuscript). Overall, my peer-review is a major revision: I suggest revising the manuscript to improve the pitfalls presented. The final goal is to improve

the overall clarity of the message to help the reader understand this fundamental topic.

Keywords: use MeSH keywords Abstract: 1. Mention the study design, study duration and study setting. 2. Mention the character of the study participants. 3.

Mention the statistical tests used for the study. 4. Mention the reports with 95% CI with upper and lower limits and its p score. 5. The conclusion should be drawn on the basis of the study reports, not on an assumption. Manuscript 6. Remove the sub-titles in the introduction part. 7. Mention in detail about orthotic sole, its role, merits and demerits in PF. 8. Mention the gaps monitored by the researcher in the previous studies. 9. Include the study aim and objectives. 10. Include the clinical significance of this study over clinicians, patients, and researchers after the study hypothesis. 11.

Mention the diagnostic criteria for PF and its ICD classification. 12. Mention the ethical approval number and clinical trial registration. 13. Present the study as per the CONSORT guidelines format. 14. Mention in detail the character of study participants.

15. Mention who has diagnosed the participants and their qualification and experience. 16. Mention the outcome measures measured in the study its reliability and validity and its interpretation. 17. Mention the blinding procedures in detail. 18. The sample size calculation was not apt to this study, please revise it with reference. 19.

Mention the demographic details of the study participants. 20. Present the reports with 95% CI with upper and lower limits for all outcome variables. 21. Describe the results in detail and clearer. 22. Include the treatment compliance rate, adverse effects and number of drop outs. 23. Mention the MCID and effect size of each variable. 24.

The discussion is not presented in a logical manner. 25. Mention in detail how the intervention changes the outcome variables in these participants? 26. The conclusion should be more concise and self-explanatory and drawn on the basis of study reports. I look forward to reading the revised version of the manuscript. Thanks again, and good luck with researching in this challenging time.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Orthopedics*

**Manuscript NO:** 84977

**Title:** Use of Orthotics with Orthotic Sandals Versus the Sole Use of Orthotics for Plantar Fasciitis: Randomised Controlled Trial

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 07334652

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United States

**Author's Country/Territory:** United Kingdom

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-04-13

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-06-23 17:38

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-06-23 18:40

**Review time:** 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Comments to the authors: This research is well-conducted, with clear, defined methods and well-thought-out statistical analysis. However, like any research, it has strengths and weaknesses that need to be considered when interpreting the results. Strengths: 1: The researchers adhered to CONSORT guidelines for RCT design, which enhances the quality and transparency of the study. This approach strengthens the internal validity of the results. The use of well-established and validated measures (NRS, FHSQ, GROG) increases the reliability of the results. 2: Randomization and having a control group allow for a more robust comparison of interventions. This design is critical in ruling out other potential influencing factors. A variety of statistical tests were used to compare within-group and between-group changes over time, improving the robustness of the findings. Weaknesses: 1: Lack of blinding could introduce bias. Even though it's acknowledged that blinding was impossible in this particular study, it is a limitation since knowing the group assignment can influence the perception of pain and improvement. 2: The diagnosis was made remotely, which may not be as accurate as a clinical examination. This situation may have resulted in potential misdiagnosis or

underdiagnosis. 3: The use of social media for recruitment could introduce bias since it may not represent the overall population affected by plantar fasciitis. 4: The dropout rate, although accounted for in sample size calculations, could introduce bias if the dropout was not random. 5: The study does not discuss the potential confounding factors which may influence the outcome, such as lifestyle, physical activity level, or concurrent treatments (e.g., physiotherapy, exercises). Overall, the study provides valuable insights into the comparative effectiveness of two interventions for managing plantar fasciitis. It suggests that the combined use of orthotics and orthotic sandals may offer additional benefits over the use of orthotics alone in terms of pain reduction. However, given the limitations mentioned, the findings should be interpreted with caution. Future research could benefit from blinded assessments, more diverse recruitment strategies, and consideration of potential confounding factors.