

OPEN PEER REVIEW REPORT 2

Name of journal: Neural Regeneration Research

Manuscript NO: NRR-D-19-00127

Title: Expression Pattern of Slit1-3 and Robo1-2 in Injured Mouse Peripheral Nervous System

Reviewer's Name: Sheng Yi

Reviewer's country: China

Date sent for review: 2019-03-26

Date reviewed: 2019-03-27

Review time: 1 day

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors systemically examined the expression levels of Slit1-3 and Robo1-2 in the spinal cord, DRG, and sciatic nerve stump (proximal site, injury site, and distal site) after sciatic nerve transection injury in mouse.

Experiments are well-designed and results are convincing. However, the authors mentioned that they used uninjured site as the normal control. However, in figures, controls were labelled as 0d control which is a little bit misleading because animals underwent sham surgery are sometimes labelled as 0d. The authors need to clarify the selection of normal controls. And if they use 0d control and compare 4d, 7d, 10d, 14d to 0d control, ANOVA instead of student's t-test should be used for comparisons.

Some minor issues:

The authors should list the full name of DRG (dorsal root ganglion) in the abstract and introduction session instead of in the result session in P4.

In "Materials and methods", the quantification of PCR outcomes should use $2^{-(\Delta\Delta C(T))}$ method instead of $-2(\Delta\Delta C(T))$ method.

The description of Western blots data in Figure 2D was introduced after the description of Figure 4, the authors may need to re-organize the order their figures/result session.

Meanwhile, it is very interesting that Robo1 showed different molecular weights after nerve injury. Have the authors observed similar results in the developing nerves? In the injured spinal cord? The authors mentioned it in the result, it would be perfect if the authors can discuss more about it.