

Dear reviewer,

first we would like to thank you for the review, the comments and the remarks you have made. Through your constructive comments, the quality of our brief report could be substantially increased. The corresponding answers and comments are listed below. Please let us know, if there is anything else we can do.

---

Lines 37-39: you speak about gait and postural control, it is true. I found on MDPI database this paper about the effect of insoles on gait parameters and I think it is worthy to be insert in your introduction to get a stronger basis: <https://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/17/12/4569>

→ Thank you for helping us to improve our paper! We added the paper in the introduction and discussion.

Line 116-117: It is not clear if the VAS scale was specific for foot, Achilles tendon, knee and back separately or if the VAS scale was generalized without any specification about the area of pain. It seems the second option, but can it be possible to explicit it better?

This comment has now been added to the methods and discussion (lines 121-123, 279-282).

The detailed description of the sample lacks. It is very useful and it must be added. It is interesting to add information about: health status of the sample, rate of drop-out of the sample (how many subjects completed the study?). Did the orthopedic technicians perform some changes on the given insoles in case of patient's discomfort?

We are absolutely in line with you. The missing information was added: see “health status” lines 96-97; “In case of any discomfort” (line 130); Dropouts (lines 95-96).

The discussion is detailed and well written, in particular the lines 222-262. Congratulation. I suggest to create a sub-paragraph "Limitations" for the lines 263-274.

→ Thank you very much. The authors are aware that the results need to be discussed critically and provide a good basis for future research in the field of insoles. The authors adapted the structure of the discussion.