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Author's response to reviews: see over
How was the outcome of Charcot Foot defined?

The diagnosis of Charcot foot was based on history and clinical examination which were confirmed by X-rays. It has been added under the heading of Material and Methods, subheading 2.3 Charcot osteoarthropathy, line no 110 in the revised manuscript.

Was it the sufficient criteria to make the clinical diagnosis of the condition?

Our criteria for diagnosis for charcot foot was sufficient, based on clinical examination and X-rays finding. Although MRI is Gold standard but as the X-rays findings of charcot foot in our study were beyond any doubt so MRI examination was not done. The same criteria has been reported by Rogers, L.C., et al., 2011 [1], [1] Rogers, L.C., et al., The Charcot foot in diabetes. Diabetes Care, 2011. 34(9): p. 2123-9.

The data was adjusted for covariates for examining the association. It has been added to revised manuscript under heading Material and Methods, sub heading 2.7 Statistical analysis, line no 148.

Why was GLM chosen?

We have determined the association between the variables by using Linear Regression (GLM) and Pearson correlation both. But Later on, we presented the results of pearson correlation in the study as it was already mentioned under the provided tables of last manuscript. Please ignore the line about using GLM, We have rephrased the line under heading Material and Methods, sub heading, 2.7, Statistical analysis, line no 150 that we have used the pearson correlation for examining association.

The new name ‘Sakina Institute of Diabetes and Endocrine Research’ (SiDER) of the institute has been replaced with Specialist Diabetes Clinic (SDC) and added under heading Material and methods sub heading 2.1 line no. 92.

Based upon the other Editor’s comments,

a. The sample size ‘n’ has been added in charcot foot’s table no 3 on page no 17.

b. The "Charcot Foot" label has been excluded from this table no 3 on page no 17.

c. The neuropathy tables have been excluded.

d. The validity of statistics has been checked.

e. Tables have been consolidated including the table showing the age wise distribution of the deformity.