**Supplemental Table 4**. A league table of percentage differences in SEBT-PM scores with their 95% CIs intervals

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Wait-And-See |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.1 (-6.6 to 14.8);p = 0.70 | CTFO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.2 (-7.6 to 13.8);p = 0.78 | -1 (-12.6 to 10.6);p = 0.96 | PFO |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.3 (-7.3 to 18);p = 0.54 | 1.2 (-15 to 17.4);p = 0.97 | 2.2 (-14 to 18.4);p = 0.93 | SAB |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9.4 (-2.3 to 21.2);p = 0.27 | 5.4 (-9.5 to 20.3);p = 0.72 | 6.4 (-8.5 to 21.3); p = 0.64 | 4.2 (-11.9 to 20.3);p = 0.82 | Orthotic insoles + bracing |  |  |  |  |
| 3.4 (-4.9 to 11.6);p = 0.66 | -0.8 (-11.4 to 10);p = 0.97 | 0.2 (-10.4 to 10.9); p = 0.99 | -2 (-16.4 to 12.5); p = 0.93 | -6.1 (-18.2 to 6); p = 0.56 | CFO |  |  |  |
| 8.7 (-0.7 to 17.9);p = 0.18 | 4.5 (-8.9 to 17.9); p = 0.75 | 5.5 (-7.9 to 18.9);, p = 0.67 | 3.3 (-9.5 to 16.1); p = 0.82 | -0.9 (-12.7 to 11.1);p = 0.74 | 5.3 (-5.3 to 15.9); p = 0.65 | SAS |  |  |
| 2.4 (-1.1 to 6);p = 0.38 | -1.6 (-12.9 to 9.6);  p = 0.92 | -0.7 (-11.9 to 10.6); p = 0.97 | -2.8 (-16 to 10.3);;p = 0.87 | -7 (-19.3 to 5.3);p = 0.57 | -0.9 (-10 to 8.2); p = 0.63 | -6.1 (-16.1 to 3.7); p = 0.79 | Taping |  |
| 1.1 (-4.7 to 6.9); p = 0.89 | -3 (-15.2 to 9.2); p = 0.84 | -1.97 (-14.2 to 10.2); p = 0.91 | -4.2 (-18 to 9.8), p = 0.78 | -8.3 (-21.5 to 4.7); p = 0.61 | -2.2 (-12.4 to 7.9); p = 0.68 | -7.6 (-18.5 to 3.4); p = 0.77 | -1.3 (-6.8 to 4.1); p = 0.74 | Placebo |

No differences between treatment and control groups were observed when the material of ankle and foot orthotic devices was accounted for; the reported changes did not exceed the established minimal detectable change of 13.6% for clinical relevance; CFO = custom-made foot orthosis; CTFO = custom-made with textured surface foot orthosis; PFO = prefabricated foot orthosis; SAB = semi-rigid ankle brace; SAS = soft ankle support; SEBT-PM= Star Excursion Balance Test – posteromedial.