

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT 1

**Name of journal:** Neural Regeneration Research

**Manuscript NO:** NRR-D-18-00411

**Title:** Animal models of amyotrophic lateral sclerosis: a comparison of model validity

**Reviewer's Name:** Carolyn Tallon

**Reviewer's country:** USA

**Date sent for review:** 2018-06-13

**Date reviewed:** 2018-06-25

**Review time:** 12 days

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript presents information on ALS animal models in an unbiased manner highlighting pros and cons of the current models available. Other than minor issues related to the clarity of the presentation of information the manuscript is well written and informative.

The authors present a nice summation of current mouse and zebrafish models of ALS. They provide information on the pros and cons of each model in an unbiased manner highlighting important aspects relevant to what makes a good animal model. Overall, the information is presented well however minor improvements could be made to improve the clarity of the way the information is presented.

It would be nice to have a simple table with all the models included to quickly and easily compare them to each other. This would improve the usefulness of this review beyond what is already presented and make it a nice resource for deciding on which animal model to use for particular studies.

Reorganizing the subheadings for each model above the paragraphs preceding the pros and cons sections would improve the clarity and flow while reading the manuscript. It was a bit confusing reading the first pros/cons section then reading a paragraph about a different model.

The manuscript could benefit from a little more editing, especially in the introduction section. Some parts are repetitive (mention rodents as the main model many times in a short section) and others are missing key words (line 51 "the absence of UMN..." was most likely meant to include degeneration but it is missing).