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Reviewer's report:

• Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)

  1) Describe the rational for testing multiple times and how the results are valid despite subjecting the animals to several tests.

  2) The power analysis to say why 6 animals per groups especially in a CCI model, where a fifth of the animals do not develop neuropathic pain and the SEM is high.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

  1) In the paper is not mentioned that which part of the sciatic nerve was used for histological and biochemical evaluation. In CCI model the proximal part of the nerve is histologically normal but the distal part shows the Wallerian degeneration and has abnormal features.

  2) Since they did the biochemical estimation, the method of euthanasia and the chemical which was used should be mentioned

Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

  1) All y-axes should start at 0. The references cited do so for the data.

  2) In mechanical allodynia the number of used filaments (with which force) should be mentioned.

  3) For measuring the mechanical hyperalgesia I don’t know how they measured the time which in the control day and most of the days in normal and sham animals. It is less than 0.5 second!!

  10) The SEM is almost the same in Fig.1-7, It is unlikely that data is so tight. This a major concern, data are without any fluctuations in the graphs and with very small SEM. Can they include a tabulated version so that SEM values are more apparent, such as the SEM in Table 1.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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