

## OPEN PEER REVIEW REPORT 1

**Reviewer:** Tufan Mert, University of Cukurova, Adana, Turkey.

**Comments to authors:**

Authors reported the regenerative actions of skeletal muscle-derived cells in animals. Also they suggest that skeletal muscle-derived cells can be an alternative cell source for reconstruction of peripheral nerve defects. This is an interesting experimental study. Analysis and tests used in this study are well performed and provide reliable results. However, I have several comments,

1. This study is an experimental study in rats. Therefore, this situation should be expressed in title and other section of manuscript.
2. Some important numerical values/data should be added abstract and result section.
3. What are the advantages of skeletal muscle-derived cells than other stem cells?
4. Authors should be added more detail about total number of animals, groupings (n=? animals in groups, number of each test etc.
5. Statistical analysis should be detailed. Dependent or independent groups, factors for test choosing of parametric or non-parametric test etc.
6. Abbreviation should be checked throughout the manuscript, particularly in the figure legends.
7. Both strengths and weakness of skeletal muscle-derived cells should be stated in discussion.