

Peer Review File

Article information: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/atm-20-7524>

Reviewer A

Comment 1: The authors present the search strategy and then move directly into the narrative with no summary or list of what will be presented. The headings make sense, but the review itself seems a bit fragmented. There is not a clear outline of the narrative review. Consider expanding on the Introduction (lines 74-76) to include a brief listing of the key information that will be provided.

Reply 1: Thank you for your comment. We agree with your suggestion. An outline of the narrative review is now provided.

Please see revised Introduction (lines 72-82)

Comment 2: Lines 134-139 seem to be separate from the body of the paragraph starting on 127. Is this a list or stand alone sentences? It is not clear.

Reply 2: Thank you for pointing this out. The text has been revised to make it more homogenous and to facilitate reading.

Please see revised lines 131-132, and 140-143

Comment 3: line 170 "hindfoot"

Reply 3: Thank you, corrected.

Please see revised line 173

Comment 4: Clubfoot Classification systems: Dimeglio and Pirani have the most detailed description and are the most widely used. However, if the other systems are listed, they should be fully explained as well. Some are left vague example: Ponseti and Smoley, what is good acceptable and poor cutoffs for each parameter?

Reply 4: Thank you for pointing this out. We have given more information about acceptable and poor cutoff for each parameter of the Ponseti and Smoley classification.

Please see revised chapter 'Clubfoot Classification systems/Ponseti and Smoley classification', lines 317-320.

Moreover, the references has been added (1963); please see Ref. number 19.

Comment 5: Clubfoot evaluation during growth Lines 315-347: What about other evaluations outside of xray? Such as gait analysis or pedobarographs? Both have been shown to provide valuable clinical information to the treating physician about the biomechanics and function of the foot.

Reply 5: Thank you for your comment. We agree. Some information are now provided about gait analysis and pedobarography.

Please see revised chapter 'Clubfoot evaluation during growth'. We have added the subchapter 'Gait analysis and plantar pressure measurements', lines 356-370. Moreover, 4 additional references have been added: please see ref. 21, 22, 23 and 24.

Comment 6: The authors have not discussed what to look for in a clinical examination after intervention? Is the information provided for just the initial evaluation? If not then consider breaking the paper into Initial evaluation and then evaluation during growth.

Reply 6: Thank you for your comment. The narrative review is about initial evaluation only. Therefore, the chapter has been left unchanged in its structure. However, the conclusion section has been shortened.

Reviewer B:

Comment 1: Abstract

- The abstract is very good. Congratulations.

- Line 42-43: although it makes sense, the comparison with scoliosis is a bit out of context. Review this comparison.

Reply 1: Thank you for pointing this out. A similar observation was also made by the other reviewer. We have therefore removed the sentence.

Please see revised Abstract (lines 42-44) and Text (lines 131-132).

Comment 2: Introduction

- Line 69: Add reference at the end of the sentence.

Reply 2: Thank you, we agree.

This information was retrieved from Ref. 1. Added.

Comment 3: Search Strategy

- Line 69: Add the exact search line made in Medline and EMBASE to give more quality to the methodology. In order to improve the quality of the article, the authors could add the number of articles included in the review, and some details such as the location of the research center, for example.

Reply 3: Thank you for your questions. Search strategy has been clarified.

Please see revised text, lines 85-93.

Comment 4: Review

- The article is very good on topics. However, on the classification I would add a paragraph on the difficulty in applying the classifications and the difference in the interobserver result. This discussion is important.

Reply 4: Thank you for pointing this out. Requested information/discussion has been added.

Please see revised text, lines 191-195 and lines 203-209.

Comment 5: The authors did not comment on the cases of neglected congenital clubfoot. What is the difference in clinical examination? Do they use the same classifications? This point in the study with a specific topic would be interesting, especially for readers from developing countries.

Reply 5: Thank you for your comment. We agree this is an interesting point but it is out of the scope of the current review, which is about initial evaluation only. In particular, the present review is part of a Special Issue where assessment/evaluation of neglected deformities will be assessed in another chapter. Therefore, the current chapter has been left unchanged as to avoid

duplicate information within the special issue.
Thank you for your understanding.

Comment 6: Conclusion

- The conclusion is long. I suggest making it more concise and smaller.

Reply 6: Thank you for pointing this out. The Conclusion paragraph has been shortened as requested.

Please see Conclusion, lines 382-387.