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Reviewer’s report:

This is a very interesting and correctly presented study protocol. The study design seems to be appropriate and the outcome measures are reported correctly.

I have the following minor comments

Minor Comments

1. Please Re-Phrase the Study Hypotheses P.2 Lines 44-46. :"There are three study hypotheses. rTMS over the lower limb motor area in patients with SCI will improve: (1) motor function, (2) sensory function and, (3) reduce spasticity". In The background some studies shown no changes Your ref. 13,22 and 23. Did you expect no significant improves? Please Expand the study hypotheses

2. Washout Period mus be justified. P.6 Line 138. Please provide Information about why you use a 2-week washout period instead of a longer or shorter period

3. P.3 Lines 68-74. Expand the information on the type of corticospinal stimulation mentioned in this paragraph. Is it the same type of stimulation rTMS?

4. P.4 Lines 83-85. Please expand information about the effect size

Level of interest
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable

Quality of figures
All images and figures within the manuscript should be genuine i.e. without evidence of manipulation. No specific feature within an image may be enhanced, obscured, moved, removed,
or introduced. If you have concerns about the veracity of the figures you should choose the first option below.

**Statistical review**
Is it essential that this manuscript is seen by an expert statistician? If so, please give your reasons in your report.
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