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**Reviewer's report:**

Thank you for asking me to review this valuable study.

I have several issues I would like you to address:

1) In the abstract you state that skin tears are the most common reason for attention from a community nurse and in care homes they are the second most common wound after pressure ulcers. Do you have a reference to support this in your region?

2) You state that the Payne and Martin definition is the most frequently used definition in the literature. While I agree that this is true for the literature published prior to 2011, after 2011 the ISTAP skin tear definition is the most frequently quoted in the literature. I have just completed an extensive systematic review on this subject.

3) on page 5 you state that skin tears are predominately treated in the community. Can you reference this statement?

4) your study population was community patients and residents in care homes, can you please define the differences between the 2 populations?

5) I would like to see a short summary of the methods for those who did not read your first paper. If I had not read the first paper I would have had many questions. For example, how were the participants randomised? Did you include individuals with cognitive impairment and if so how did you obtain consent?
6) You have stated that the Payne Martin is a validated tool, Payne and Martin have claimed validation however they did not publish their results. The STAR and ISTAP classification systems are the only systems with published validation.

7) THANK YOU for including patient stakeholders!!!!!

8) Did you assess causal associations? IN table 3 you have listed reported causes, did you place them into themes? Were there differences between those in care homes and the community?

9) You have used brand names in the body of the paper, can you use a generic name?

Thank you for including me in this review. You are making a wonderful contribution to skin tear research.
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