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Reviewer's report:

The analysis by Atkin et al. assessed the safety, tolerability, and efficacy of Cycloidal Vibration Therapy (CVT) as a novel treatment for intermittent claudication in patients with peripheral arterial disease (PAD). I thought that this analysis explored a very interesting clinical question but I do have a few comments, more specifically:

Major Limitations

1. Please provide a description of the feasibility outcomes in the Methods section.

2. Provide a rationale for the sample size.

3. Provide a rationale for using KM curves to assess the effect on pain-free walking time (PFWT) and maximum walking time (MWT). Why was the mean change from baseline not reported?

4. Were other outcomes considered, such as pain-free walking distance and maximum walking distance?

5. On page 11 (Line 35), there is a paragraph that begins "The results showed a positive improvement in participants' quality of life… baseline". This statement is very unclear. Were more outcomes measured in the study? Please provide clarity.

6. Although this is a feasibility trial, it was a single arm trial and there is no comparator. The lack of head-to-head comparison should be listed in the Limitations section.

7. How was patient compliance measured?

Minor Limitations

1. There appears to be some issues with the referencing numbers in the manuscript. Please convert any "Error! Reference source not found" messages to the intended references.

2. "Trail" needs to be changed to "trial" on pages 3 and 6.

3. Titles in Table 1 are unclear.
4. Page 6 (Line 39) there are repeated words that need to be deleted: "Exclusion criteria included Exclusion criteria included: ".
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