

## OPEN PEER REVIEW REPORT 1

**Name of journal:** Neural Regeneration Research

**Manuscript NO:** NRR-D-20-00563

**Title:** A visualization and bibliometric analysis of publications on necroptosis in the field of Neuroscience during 2007-2019

**Reviewer's Name:** Sathyaseelan S. Deepa

**Reviewer's country:** USA

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This review is prepared by bibliometric analysis of necroptosis in the field of neuroscience during 2007-2009. There are several points to be considered before accepting this manuscript for publication

#### Comments

1. The authors failed to express the importance of bibliometric analysis on necroptosis in the field of neuroscience. It's only a peripheral analysis and need an in-depth analysis so that it will be useful for the readers. Eg, What the necroptosis markers used in these different studies, what methodologies were used to identify necroptosis in brain, what different cell types in the brain are reported to undergo necroptosis, what are pharamacological agents commonly used etc.
2. The title is not attractive; it can be modified into recent development instead of giving the time course.
3. Necroptosis can be more understandable to general readers if the pathway is presented as a figure (Canonical and noncanonical).
4. In Fig.3 what exactly red and blue bars indicate? Provide details in figure caption
5. Most of the figures and tables convey the same meaning Eg: Figure 3/ Table1, Figure 5/Table 2, Table 4/Figure 4, 7 etc. Keep either figure or table and include other one in supplementary material if necessary
6. Hard to understand Figure 9, provide figure with more clarity and resolution
7. Most of the important molecules are not addressed in the review (like PAMPs, DAMPs, receptors, inhibitors etc.)