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Reviewer's report:

In this manuscript Chen et al. assessed the effect of foot stimulation in rat models with spinal cord injury. The study is well designed and with an adequate method. Anyhow some conclusions proposed by the authors are not adequately supported. The study only showed that in rat model a foot stimulation with 4T significantly increased bladder capacity but no effects on DO have been mentioned in the data proposed by authors. Then every mentions regarding DO in title, discussion and conclusions should be removed or alternatively supported by other data not included in this version of the manuscript.

Minor revisions: the sigle BC first appeared in the abstract without mention of the meaning of this abbreviations (Bladder capacity).

Lastly it is uncertain how this rat model can accurately replicate the condition of humans with spinal cord injury, therefore a subsequent experiment in men is awaited to confirm this promising results in rat model.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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