

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade D (Fair)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: This manuscript involves studies starting from AI in medical field and then in diabetic wounds. The literature review is limited however, author(s) might find many studies regarding diabetes and AI. My suggestion is to revise the overall literature review based on diabetes (not the whole healthcare) and then diabetic wounds and AI.

Response to review: Thank you for the valuable suggestions. Organization of paper is significantly improved. More studies are added in the literature. The paper is thoroughly revised according to the suggestions.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade D (Fair)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: The manuscript entitled “Diabetic wounds and AI: A mini-review” focuses on discussion of literature data on the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) technologies in diagnosis, prognosis, and treatment efficacy assessment of diabetic wound progression and healing. The topic is of interest to the journal audience. However, there are some concerns, which should be addressed to revise the manuscript before publication.

Response to review :Thank you for the valuable suggestions.

Major concerns:

1. The manuscript is not well-organized and titles of subsections do not properly correspond to their content. For example, in the subsections “Impact of ai in diabetic wounds” and “Impact of ai in diabetic wounds” the authors discussed the principles of AI technologies. It is recommended to discuss this in a special subsection.

Response to review: Organization has been improved. Identified subsection’s title has been changed.

2. Literature data on diabetic wound characterization and image analysis with the use of AI should be discussed in more details. It would be useful if the authors discuss in short, the pathophysiology and clinical characteristics of diabetic wound progression. Additionally, it is recommended to discuss the phenomena of “loss of protective sensation (LOPS)” and “diabetic foot ulcers (DFUs)”. See, for discussion, doi: 10.1111/iwj.13603, doi: 10.1016/j.compbomed.2021.104596, and doi: 10.1021/acsami.2c08994, and other papers.

Response to review: Thank you for the suggestions. Clinical characteristics are added as a separate section. New studies are added in the Literature review.

Other concerns:

3. Tare many repeated and general statements such as “In recent years, AI has also a noticeable impact on diabetic wound care”, “Technology has evolved swiftly in last few decades casing astronomy to entertainment fields”, etc.

Response to review: Repetition of general statements has been reduced.

4. In the Introduction, the authors stated “This research is mainly focused on external diabetic wounds” – what was a rationale for that?

Response to review :It was a typo. Initially article was planned to include only external wounds but later on review discussed diabetic wounds in general, without categorizing it into internal and external wounds. This statement was not meant to be part of the final manuscript. Statement has been removed.

5. In Title, the abbreviation AI is used, however, in the Abstract, Introduction, and in the entire text, the authors do not use this abbreviation, multiple time exploiting the term “artificial intelligence”.

Response to review : The title is changed to **Diabetic wounds and Artificial Intelligence: A mini-review**

6. English language grammar requires checking and corrections.; there are many mistakes such as “This manuscript analyze” (it should be “analyzes”), “One of the significant potential contribution” (it should be “contributions”), “As diabetic wounds comes’ (it should be “come”), etc.

Response: Writeup has been thorough reviewed and all language inconsistencies and grammatical mistakes has been removed.