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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to re-review this paper. The main concern of over-emphasis on the generalisability of the results has been dealt with (perhaps with slightly too much vigor!).

Major compulsory revisions
- I am very nervous about the use of the term "prospective cross-sectional study". Please check with editor but it is possible this study design is better described as simply as a cross-sectional design. It doesn't appear to me that the patients were followed up at all and all data reported is a "snap-shot" in time.
- typo 1st paragraph p16. "...simply..."
- typo 2nd paragraph page 10. "...non significant (p<0.05)".
- check if "generalisable" requires UK/US spelling for JFAR

Minor essential revisions
- Table 1 remains unclear to me. A simple count of active problems leads to 19, not 10 (1st paragraph page 11). Is it possible to clarify that it is possible that a patient had more than 1 active problem?
- the 80% clinical infection is ulcers is not explained well in the results section (1st paragraph page 13). This relates to above point.

Discretionary revisions
- I had trouble reconciling the importance of the way the two different approaches to the "diagnosis" of peripheral neuropathy were reported (that is, either "self-reported" as part of a co-morbidity screen or "clinically determined"). This is somewhat alleviated by the discussion 1st paragraph page 16. However, I'm not sure why a clinical diagnosis of PN or PAD were not considered as part of the univariate or multivariate process. This may be relevant as the final paragraph of page 13 highlights the high rates of these conditions in the sample as measured clinically.
- I wonder if generally the paper is a little long.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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