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**Reviewer’s report:**

The authors have addressed all of the concerns I raised in the first review and have significantly strengthened the statistical section of the protocol.

1. I only have one Minor Essential Revision:

One point that was addressed by the authors in their response, that I still feel should be amended within the text, is the issue of mortality. It appears, based on the response, that they will be collecting the foot ulcer outcome data from medical records even if the patient has died during the study period, and therefore will able to be included in the analysis (?). This is an important point to clarify as part of the protocol if this is the case. Mortality should also be mentioned as a potential limitation in this specific patient population and how it will be addressed in the relevant sections.

1. Will the study design adequately test the hypothesis?

Yes, the study proposed will be able to determine whether baseline health-status and foot assessments can be used to predict foot ulceration after 12 months in a high risk population with end-stage renal disease.

2. Are sufficient details provided to allow replication of the work or comparison with related analyses: if not, what is missing?

Yes, the procedures for recording and collecting data are well-described in the protocol.

3. Is the planned statistical analysis appropriate?

Yes, the inclusion of a biostatistician to the study team has significantly strengthened the statistical plan for study.

4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation?

Yes

5. Is the writing acceptable?

Yes

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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