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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

we thank you for the acceptation of the manuscript, " The management of neuropathic ulcers of the foot in diabetes by Shock Wave Therapy" to the publication on BMC Journals.

We read the Reviewers' comments and we made these following modifications. Minor Essential Revisions

1) In figure four the ruler seems to cover up the lesion. Would it be possible to get another picture of the same patient with a better view of the healed wound?

We are very sorry, but we haven’t another picture of the lesion in figure 4. We hope that it isn’t problem to the publish the article.

2) Why did the authors choose specifically Silvercell among the many existing dressings?

The Silvercell satisfied the need of antimicrobial action and of exudates management in all the ulcers of the study.

3) If the authors wanted to assess the real efficacy of shockwave therapy would not it have been easier to choose a simple dressing instead of an advanced dressing that could have speed up the healing process?

In according with Ethic Committee’s indications, we ensured an advanced dressing in the management of the ulcers

4) Among the exclusion criteria the authors listed ulcers more than 5 cm wide. Was this a personal choice or was it because shockwave therapy results ineffective in these cases?

During our previous preliminary experience in the application of the shock waves
for the treatment of ulcers, we found that the rate of re-epithelization was higher in big ulcers. To avoid any selection bias, we chose a homogeneous type of ulcer that was smaller than 5 cm in diameter.

Discretionary Revisions
1) Does the 72 hours interval treatment belongs to existing international standards (if yes, which one did you choose to apply?) or did the authors choose it themselves (if yes, according to which criteria?).

We administrated the shockwaves every 72 hours for 3 sessions. We chose this protocol on the basis of our clinical experience in Orthopaedics treatment. Recently, the International Society for Medical Shockwaves Treatment published the “New guidelines for ESWT” and it suggested to apply from 1 to 6 sessions, using an interval of 1 week. However, in literature good results of angiogenesis are reported using different protocols in which the interval between each session of shock waves varies from 48 hours to two weeks. Following studies should be useful for compare the effects of protocols which are different only for the interval time between each treatment.

2) It would be nice to include a picture of the instrument at work.

We included a picture of the instrument at work in the figure 5.

Based on your assessment of the validity of the manuscript, what do you advise should be the next step?

The next steps could be to compare the effects of protocols which should be different only for the interval time between each treatment or for the dosage of shock waves.

Quality of written English

Needs some language corrections before being published

We made some language corrections with the help of a translator.

Please state the name of the ethics committee / board, which granted you permission to perform this investigation, in the Methods section of your manuscript.

Yes, we introduced in Methods section the the Ethic Committee of the University of Medicine in Bari (Italy).

2. Please include contact e-mail addresses for all authors listed on the Title Page of your manuscript.

Yes, we did it.

3. Please include a Acknowledgements section.

Yes, we did it.

We thank you for the pervious comments that give suggestions to improve our manuscript. Now we are completing this review process as we described in the previous paragraphs and we are waiting for your next answer.
Thanks,
All the Authors.