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Reviewer’s report:

1. The authors still did not answer how the treatment window and duration of HBO were chosen.

In the Method section, they mentioned that "HBO treatment began at two hours after SCI…..The HBO therapy was carried out once a day, for five days". And now they responded that "HBO treatment was employed for 5 days including the next day after SCI, and inflammation response began within 24 hours after SCI and keep rising subsequenly". It is confusing whether the HBO treatment started at the second hour or the second day after SCI? and how was this related to inflammation response? There was no any inflammation results or statement in the manuscript, which I think the authors should add it if this is the rationale for their time window and duration. In addition, in the last "response to reviewers", they stated that "In some of our pre-trials, we found that HBO treatment at the earliest possible time (within 24 hours) resulted in a better therapeutic effect". Which time point have the better best therapeutic effect? The authors should specify why they did not use this time point for the subsequent study. At least a sentence or two to discuss this time window trial is necessary. And why HBO was applied for 5 days, not 3 days, 7 days or other duration? Please add the rationale in the manuscript.

2. For paper published in other languages including Chinese, there is citation guideline available. Therefore, I don't not agree with the authors that adding the reference is not recommended. Instead, I think the authors should add the reference of their previous cystic degeneration results, and discuss the current results in relation to previous literatures.
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