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Reviewer's report:

I have considered all the guidelines and find this study to be of acceptable standard, deserving publication.

1. Major revisions:
   a) Further text is needed, even one or two sentences, about the study perspective i.e. of third-party payers. This text should specifically identify third party payers (e.g. health insurance companies and government agencies) and the types of costs that are appropriately included and excluded. Suggest that this should be undertaken on page 13 at the beginning of the section, 'Economic Outcome Definition'.
      Currently the approach to extrapolation is left up to the reader to pursue. Also the approach is not justified.
      The authors should be explicitly show the equations they used, even if in an appendix. They should also justify the use of these equations.
      They should also do the same regarding the probability of ulcer recurrence as derived from Persson et al (2000).
   c) Page 14, Sensitivity Analysis: the authors should give reasons for why they varied the parameters as they did.
   d) Pages 14-15 Sensitivity Analysis: A basic description of the Monte Carlo modelling is required (even just one or two sentences) - number of simulations, software etc.
   e) Figures: None of the figures have headings, please provide.

2. Minor Revisions
   a) Figure 1 is confusing: For the treatment phase, the box labelled 'Clostridial Collagenase Ointment (CCO) + Sharp' is not connected to a box
labelled 'Healed Words'. This implies that healed wounds are not noted for the experimental group. Can the diagram be improved accordingly?

b) Re: page 19, the phrase, 'the therapeutic effect of CCO+SD was approximately 30% greater than for the Control'
Should the 30% be 25% (35-28=7)/28=0.25

c) Supplementary Table 1 should be included in the text close to the Figures 2. It is necessary to see both Figure 2 and Supplementary Table 1 to readily understand the Markov modelling.

d) Page 10, section, Economic Analysis: This was the only one of two sections of the entire article where I found the writing cumbersome, due to long sentences with too many clauses. The section is not so much 'badly written' - but the paper would benefit from some work on the expression here. The section is very important.

e) Last sentence in page 17, leading into text at the top page 18: This section refers to Supplementary Table 2, which is titled 'Monte Carlo Simulation Results'. For the sake of consistency, suggest making some reference to Monte Carlo Modelling in the text - rather than just 'probabilistic modelling'.

f) suggest some description on how the findings are pertinent to the policies of third party payers.

Thank you for allowing me to review this report,
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