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Reviewer's report:

General

This is a report of a small study designed to assess the acceptability of a new treatment (larval therapy: maggots) in the management of chronic venous ulceration. It was undertaken as a prelude to a large RCT funded by the HTA and which is presumably now in progress.

The authors used questionnaires to define the acceptability of maggot therapy and, in brief, found that while 25% patients would not countenance it in any form, the remainder would. There was a preference for the use of bagged, rather than loose, maggots, but it was not strong.

Methodologically, the study seems sound, and the results are certainly of interest. My main criticism relates to the style. Although clearly written, it is perhaps a little too precise and measured: it could be shorter.

Minor points:

1 Discussion paragraph 1 line 3. I would avoid the word “significant” here
2 Discussion paragraph 2 lines 3 and 4. They should rephrase this: they shouldn’t report a difference when it was not significant.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

None

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

None

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

As suggested above

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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