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Reviewer's report:

The paper falls in line with the conviction that designing research and assessing QoL based on that research is trivial. However, contrary to what is believed, survey studies are one of the most difficult ones. Selecting a sufficiently large group, determining the inclusion criteria, and precise justification of these criteria constitute a sine qua non condition of the study. Furthermore, a lack of homogenous group may lead to a situation where a number of factors (especially those excluded from the analysis) may have a greater impact than the parameter to be studied. Another step in designing a research study is choosing adequate tools (standardised surveys and questionnaires). A study should present clear hypotheses, which will be verified based on relevant tests (statistical analysis).

The paper submitted for review is a result of errors made in all stages of the research. The Authors assumed a priori that chronic wounds have a major impact on QoL of patients, especially those older than 65 y.a. To validate a new tool, one should use analogous well-established tools with acknowledged clinical significance. The reference to subjective pain declaration assessed with the VAS scale cannot be considered the right approach. Moreover, it is always doubtful to use QoL questionnaires without defined categorisations based on the total scores.

The validation lacks mood assessment which may be a significant factor affecting the respondents' answers. The lack of homogeneity of the group included in the study is also clearly reflected by the fact that 55 (45.8%) of the participants did not read (did not fill in) the questionnaires individually.

The statistical analysis lacks important information:

- the Authors planned quality assessment in two stages, i.e. after inclusion to the study and after 6 weeks, there are no tables containing descriptive analysis of the results and their proper comparison

- there is no information on the statistical tests (if any) used to verify the distribution of the variables studied

- the values of a number of parameters indicate (Table 1) that t-test has been used incorrectly.

Introduction: laconic, it does not provide a concise description of the most important issues related to QoL assessment.

Aim: very difficult, most likely impossible to be achieved due to the group of patients, the tools used to assess QoL, and statistical methods.
Material: lack of clear exclusion criteria, the Authors did not obtain a homogenous group (except for having a skin wound as an inclusion criterion).

Statistical analysis: remarks above.

Results: faulty presentation of the results, lack of tables showing descriptive statistics for the repeated test.

Discussion: no clear direction, lack of references to other studies and values.

Conclusion: As it is completely detached from the results obtained, it is hard to comment on it.

I find it difficult to indicate any positive element of the paper that would favour its publication.

To conclude, I do not recommend this paper for publication.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
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**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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