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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Abstract (Background) “these infections may lead to foot ulcers and eventual lower limb amputation” maybe considered too simplistic. I would suggest re-wording expressing that tinea infections can be an agent provocateur in establishing secondary, bacterial foot infections leading to the above.

2. Introduction. The link between foot ulceration and the presence of tinea pedis is far from clear. It is suggested by the authors that foot ulcers arise from nail damage. This has not been formally tested by research - only suggested by authors. However the following sentence, has more validity – there are papers linking the presence of tinea pedis /onychomycosis to the development of lower limb cellulitis and the authors may wish to consider including these.

3. Results. The results section is slightly blurred with the discussion section - as the results section contains some discussion, which is then repeated in a short discussion section.

Minor Essential Revisions

4. Introduction. Reference 12 and 15 appear a few times in the paper and refers to papers on heart rates and headache? – Please add the correct papers in the reference list.

5. Introduction. The final sentence is in a smaller font size.

6. Introduction. In the final sentence, can the authors clarify for the reader what “these conditions” refer to? Tinea pedis and onychomycosis, or foot ulcers.

7. Introduction. Final paragraph. First sentence suggests “many studies acknowledge the complexity of treating tinea pedis and onychomycosis in people with diabetes and provide recommendations for treatment. For clarity, please can you provide these references to these papers?

8. Methods. Fourth paragraph beginning “All studies included in this review were read by two independent reviewers”. I would suggest rewording to something like “All studies in this review were read by two reviewers independently”. This also recurs later in this section.
9. Results. Second paragraph, last sentence – “examining” to replace “examined”.

10. Results. Paragraph 6. This section contains details of Gupta’s study and expresses percentages to illustrate no significant difference. A “P” value maybe more appropriate here?

11. Results. Paragraph 8. “As shown in figure 2”. This refers to the wrong figure.

12. Conclusion. First sentence, second paragraph. Substitute “alternative” for “adjunctive” or similar to improve clarity?

13. Minor errors noted in reference list – some journal names in full, some abbreviated. Also minor typos/capitalisations i.e. 10, 13, 17, 20, 23, 38, 40, 60

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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