



SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

| EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any) | Authors' response to editor's comments |
|---|--|
| <p>I have reviewed the paper. And pointed out the need for clarification.</p> | |
| <p>1. Section 2.3 Eligibility criteria: But it is important to note that presence of Vasculopathy and Neuropathy . These co morbid conditions are determinital of the outcome of the treatment.</p> | <p>Patients with obvious vasculopathy and other significant co-morbidities that could potentially confound the treatment outcomes were excluded from the study as shown by the stringent inclusion criteria.</p> |
| <p>2. Section 2.4.2 Blinding: But each group should be marked to avoid confusion.</p> | <p>Possible confusion was avoided by the following: i. All subjects were assigned serial numbers ii. The assigned numbers were noted alongside the assigned study group by an assistant (without the knowledge of the investigator) and the record was preserved iii. The investigator was blinded to each study subject's dressing material (whether honey or povidone iodine). He measured wound parameters and took samples. iv. The results of the different study participants were reconciled against their assigned study groups using their assigned serial numbers after the study was concluded to avoid bias.</p> |
| <p>3. Section 2.4.3 Details of the study: Honey should be natural because artificial honey also available. And the efficacy will vary.</p> | <p>The honey used in the study was natural honey procured from a single commercial source of locally produced natural honey. This eliminated possible bias from using honey originating from different sources which would invariably have had differing efficacies.</p> |
| <p>4. Discussion: Duration of Diabetes, Diabetes status and response to management of diabetes are key factors to be considered while comparing the results of the study.</p> | <p>These data were not considered during the conceptualization of the study and were therefore not obtained during the study.</p> |
| <p>5. Conclusion: Aim of the study has not been explained in conclusion. There is no statement regarding the method of dressing and its superiority over other one. What is the effect of different dressings on the Microorganisms flora?</p> | <p>"Both honey and povidone iodine were comparable in controlling the wound microbiota significantly enough to prevent wound infection and allow for healing to progress. " This statement has been added to bolster the conclusion.</p> |