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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript titled "Role of defensins in diabetic wound healing" is narrative review. The title, abstract and key worlds cover main aspects of the manuscript. As this is narrative review there is no special methods to be included, however I would ask for the researches search strategies. Yet, as researcher Shen BZ were responsible for navigating the literature and sharing the relevant studies that were included in this review please state the methods. Moreover as in the references (66 numbers) only 27 are from last 5 years it would add more complex informations about the relevant studies were included. Thus discussion about results described by the authors is quite hard to estimate with not known methods strategy. In my opinion the discussion of the found results should be updated - as I wrote only 27 references are from last 5 years. The tables and figures are informative and well prepared. Last: I have some doubts to the authors contribution - the "formating the citations and compilation of the references, verifying spelling, punctuation and grammatical errors" are technical point of article so is it right to be an author of the whole study?
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**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

1. The literature regarding anti-microbial peptide is missing and authors have not discussed in detail what are defensins and their properties. Authors did not add literature regarding the expression level of alpha and beta defensins in case of diabetic wound.

2. Role of defensins with regards to MMP-2 and MMP-9 is very unclear. More studies related to role of defensins and MMP-2 and 9 need to be added.

3. Authors should address the findings of in vivo diabetic wound models with regards to healing effect of defensins.

4. Mechanistic pathways are also not discussed in a way that they should be. Authors should add a figure that link the role of defensins with the mechanistic pathway which authors discussed to make it more clear.