

PEER-REVIEW REPORT 1

Name of journal: Neural Regeneration Research

Manuscript NO: NRR-D-18-00614

Title: Differences in neuroplasticity after spinal cord injury in varying animal models and humans

Reviewer's Name: Xiangbing Wu

Reviewer's country: USA

Date sent for review: 2018-08-30

Date reviewed: 2018-09-14

Review time: 15 Days

1. Do you consider this paper is hotspots or important areas in the research field related to neural regeneration?

Very important.

2. Which area do you think this paper falls into? Neurorepair, neuroprotection, neuroregeneration or neuroplasticity.

Neuroplasticity.

3. Is the manuscript technically sound, and do the data support the conclusions?

Yes.

4. Has the statistical analysis been performed appropriately and rigorously?

Review paper, no statistical available.

5. Is the manuscript presented in an intelligible fashion and written in Standard English?

Yes.

6. Your peer review comments will be published as an open peer review report. Do you agree to have your name included with the published article?

Yes.

Manuscript Rating Question(s):	Scale	Rating
The subject addressed in this article is worthy of investigation. (3 as the best score)	[1-3]	3
The information presented was new. (5 as the best score)	[1-5]	5

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This review is very excellent paper. Authors went through the medline database of animal models of spinal cord injury from 1946 to 2018 to summarize the neuroplasticity and circuitry in rodent animal, non-human primates and human and also compared their difference. Those differences and the some issues that raised from the paper are very important for the basic and clinical translational research.

The review is neat and clarity. It provides numerous information and references. It is a very good summary on the big data of spinal cord injury in different species.