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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
No

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

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

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

Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest
An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English
Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review
No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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