

We really appreciate your sincere review. Here's a point-to-point summary of our answers.

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

This study entitled "Does the advantage of transcutaneous oximetry (TcpO₂) measurements in diabetic foot ulcer apply equally to free flap reconstruction?" seems to have been generally well executed and written. Furthermore, I believe that this paper will be of great interest to the readers.

Answer: We really appreciate your review.

However, I have a few remarks that require authors attention. Title Please add the type of article in your title.

Answer: We add type of article. We would like to change the type of manuscript to retrospective study. Due to our mistake, we submitted it as a case control study, but it is a retrospective study. We are sorry about the mistake.

Introduction Please state the clear hypothesis of your study at the end of Introduction.

Answer: We add hypothesis at the end of introduction. "We assumed that the reduced pattern of TcpO₂ would apply equally to FF reconstruction and we decided to conduct a study to determine whether the change in TcpO₂ levels would recover as wound healing occurred." Thank you for your good point.

Materials and Methods Statistics Why the sample size calculation was not performed?

Answer: Because the article was a retrospective study, we did not perform sample size calculation. We apologize for submitting this as a case control study.

Discussion Please begin Discussion with the main findings of your study.

Answer: we added main result at the first of discussion. "In our study, the proportion of TcpO₂ levels in FFs that did not increase by more than 30 mmHg even after POD 30 was 35.3% (6/17). Before discussing, let us firstly mention the relationship between DFU and TcpO₂." Thanks for the good point.

