

Additional file 3. Qualitative data-syntheses

Outcome	Level of evidence	Results	References
<i>semi-rigid FOs (a) versus soft FOs (b)</i>			
compliance	inconclusive	<i>0.26 hour more wearing time a day in favor of treatment with intervention a; P = n/a</i>	Chalmers et al. 2000 (31)
costs of FOs	inconclusive	<i>-0.03 (95% CI -0.08 – 0.03) QALYs in favor of treatment with intervention a; P = 0.46</i>	Rome et al. 2016 (34)
patient satisfaction	inconclusive	<i>a and b were both nominated as preferred FOs by 11 (out of 24) participants; P = n/a</i>	Chalmers et al. 2000 (31)
		<i>82% more participants nominated intervention b as preferred FOs; P = n/a</i>	Chang et al. 2011 (35)
		<i>20% more participants nominated intervention a as preferred FOs; P = n/a</i>	Hodge et al. 1995 (36)
<i>custom-made (semi-rigid) FOs (a) versus ready-made (soft) FOs (b)</i>			
foot function, construct plantar pressure	inconclusive	<i>0.99 (16%) lower forefoot plantar pressure (PTI) in favor of treatment with intervention b; P = n/a</i>	Hodge et al. 1995 (36)
patient satisfaction	inconclusive	<i>20% more participants nominated intervention a as preferred FOs; P = n/a</i>	Hodge et al. 1995 (36)
<i>total-contact (semi-rigid) FOs (a) versus non-total-contact (soft) FOs (b)</i>			
costs of FOs	inconclusive	<i>-0.03 (95% CI -0.08 – 0.03) QALYs in favor of treatment with intervention a; P = 0.46</i>	Rome et al. 2016 (34)
patient satisfaction	inconclusive	<i>a and b were both nominated as preferred FOs by 11 (out of 24) participants; P = n/a</i>	Chalmers et al. 2000 (31)
		<i>82% more participants nominated intervention b as preferred FOs; P = n/a</i>	Chang et al. 2011 (35)
		<i>20% more participants nominated intervention a as preferred FOs; P = n/a</i>	Hodge et al. 1995 (36)

selective laser sintered FOs (a) versus standard custom-made FOs (b)

foot function, plantar pressure	inconclusive	9.3 (13.6) lower medial forefoot plantar pressure (PP) in favor of treatment with intervention a; $P = 1.00$	Gibson et al. (11)
foot function, gait	inconclusive	2 more steps per minute (cadence) in favor of treatment with intervention b; $P = n/a$	Pallari et al. 2010 (38)
patient satisfaction	inconclusive	2.4 higher VAS fit of FOs in favor of treatment with intervention b; $P \geq 0.05$	Pallari et al. 2010 (38)

FOs with metatarsal bars (a) versus FOs with metatarsal domes (b)

foot pain	inconclusive	7 mm on VAS-score less pain in favor of treatment with intervention b	Hodge et al. 1995 (36)
patient satisfaction	inconclusive	intervention a was nominated by 30% of participants and intervention b by 50% as preferred FOs	Hodge et al. 1995 (36)
		intervention a was nominated by 30% of participants and intervention b by 70% as preferred FOs	Jackson et al. 2004 (32)

FOs = foot orthoses. VAS = visual analogue scale. QALYs = quality-adjusted life years. PTI = pressure time integral. PP = peak pressure.