

Dear Sir/Madam,

Thank you very much for sending us the reviewers' comments. They were applied as follows.

<b>Reviewer #00467221</b>	
1. page 4 line 13: change the word "autonomic" to "peripheral"	The change was made.
2. Page 5 line 5 from bottom " As few studies have focused on the use of ...diabetic neuropathy". Is there any study done before? If so, it should be cited. If not, change like "Since no study was done with use of ...".	A reference was added.
3. Page 2 abstract and page 8 line 7 from the bottom. The definition of "sensitivity", "precision" and "accuracy" should be mentioned explicitly. In particular difference between "precision" and "accuracy".	The terms were edited and definitions were added.
4. Spell-out all acronym like CBC, FBS,...ScEx-MNSII in somewhere.	All acronyms were spelled out.
5. Page 8 line 5. "... was compared with the final diagnosis recorded.. " How "final diagnosis" was made? Ultimate diagnosis of diabetic neuropathy is proof of damage by nerve biopsy. However, this invasive method is difficult perform in clinical setting, thus next alternative method is skin biopsy to show reduction in nerve ending. If no morphological studies was done in "final diagnosis", this "final diagnosis" sounds like "consensus diagnosis". Authors should clear about this point.	More explanation was added to this section.
<b>Reviewer #02446542</b>	
The authors describe a system for the diagnosis and evaluation of diabetic neuropathy that seems to be reliable. The manuscript is generally well written although some abbreviations, like "ASP.Net" and "MATLAB", should be defined.	The abbreviations were defined.
Furthermore, it could be useful authors to give some data about the feasibility of the method in daily clinical practice, regarding for example the cost, compared to other systems.	As there was no similar study to report the related findings, this issue was addressed in the limitation and conclusion sections.