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Reviewer’s report:

Major compulsory revision:

3. Discretionary revision: The authors may consider adding one sentence on the results of the studies included in the review, as well as the fact that most studies only included diabetic ulcers.

Agreed. The results section of the Abstract has been changed as follows:

"From the studies included in this review, an increase in healing time and a decrease in wound size were identified following extracorporeal shock wave therapy. The majority of wounds assessed were associated with diabetes. The effectiveness of ESWT as an addition to standard care has only been assessed in one RCT. Quality assessment scores ranged from 38-63% (mean 53%). In summary, there is limited evidence to support extracorporeal shock wave therapy as a treatment for lower limb ulceration."

I do not see where the "increase in healing time" comes from: from the results section, it looks as though only one study (Moretti et al) studied healing time, and actually reported a shorter healing time in ESWT-treated patients. Moreover, would it be possible to say anything on healing rates?

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
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