

Answering reviewers

We thank the reviewers for the review and their valuable suggestions.

Reviewer#1:

Specific Comments to Authors: This article focuses on the role of and results of comparative studies about usage of traditional medicines in managing diabetic ulcers. The topic is interesting.

Answer: We thank for the kind words.

Reviewer#2:

Specific Comments to Authors:

1.It is necessary to reduce the number of words to meet the requirements of journal

Answer: We have reduced the word count of main text from 5286 to 3945 as per the comments without changing the context of the article.

2.The progress of biofilm needs to be added to the Diabetic foot ulcers: a wonder continuum section

Answer: We have added the biofilm information in the said section.

3.In traditional medicine, animal drugs such as maggots and leeches and so on were also used to the treatment of diabetic foot, which should be supplemented.

Answer: We have added the data on animal drugs, relevant to the scope of this minireview.

Reviewer#3:

Specific Comments to Authors:

1.As the methods section evolved , how do the authors discuss and compare with existing approaches.

Answer: We have addressed the issue in conclusion section. Comparison of existing approaches may not be valid because of :

a. Different systems have their own philosophy and education pattern. So the data reporting may not always be consistent.

b. The available data is inadequate in many parameters, in-depth meta-analysis might be needed, which is out of the scope of mini-review.

2. Would the results be strengthened using additional methods so helping to validate the results?

Answer: Intricate details of wounds, their progress and other points related to the final outcome are not covered in many papers. In-depth meta-analysis may help but framing a multicentric or high-volume studies with interpathy collaboration may help better.