

ANSWERING REVIEWERS

ESPS Manuscript NO: 27755

- Comment:** The title is referring directly to the problem at hand. The abstract is sufficient. Introduction is adequate.

Response: We have changed the title as follows: “A novel scoring system to assess spinal cord injury patients: Nutech Functional Score”.
- Comment:** Material and Methods in this subchapter, it is mentioned that the study was approved by Institutional Review board (IRB) of Nutech Mediworld. They mention some lists, but this is not referring to materials and methods.

Response: The NFS scoring system was formed after studying ASIA impairment scale. The data was collected, assessed and scored. Finally, the data was frozen and put into practice.
- Comment:** Results they stated that have developed a 63 point grading system which consisted of five grades in number for each parameter. For non-progressive diseases, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 denoted worst, bad, not so bad, good and normal, respectively. It seems that it is a detailed but rather complicated system.

Response: We need a detailed system to evaluate response and regeneration of the spinal cord.
- Comment:** Discussion is extended, ending with the ascertainment that “the universal use of the NFS will help in determining its usability in assessing the improvement in patients being treated with other therapies”.

Response: At our facility, we evaluated the effectiveness of NFS in assessing the patients treated with human embryonic stem cell (hESC) therapy.
- Comment:** The authors conclude “that The NFS scoring system for SCI in numeric form is an adequate instrument to examine and score the patients with SCI”.

Response: Yes, the study focuses on the advantages of using NFS score for assessing the patients with SCI. Moreover, the loopholes associated with the use of ASIA scale have also been highlighted.
- Comment:** References: 11 papers are included. Although with the submitted manuscript, authors are proposing a detailed system with 63 parameters and five grades in order to evaluate SCI, the lack of application in patients, makes it doubtful as far as its efficacy in the clinical practice.

Response: We have used this scoring system to assess patients treated with human embryonic stem cell therapy. The results of clinical application are being presented in different manuscript (under preparation).
- Comment:** The present manuscript, as it is organized, without any clinical application, it needs revision and the inclusion of clinical application in order to have additional proof that in its present form is useful in the everyday practice.

Response: We have used this scoring system to assess patients treated with human embryonic stem cell therapy. This paper is only introducing this scoring system. The results of clinical application are being presented in different manuscript (under preparation).

Sr. No.	Comment	Response
1	<p>The title can be revised as “Nutech functional score: a novel scoring system to assess spinal cord injury patients?”, since any new system can be finally established only by wide acceptance and application.</p>	<p>We have revised the article name as “Nutech functional score: a novel scoring system to assess spinal cord injury patients”.</p>
2	<p>The following expression can be put more logical and symmetric. Instead of “For non-progressive diseases, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 denoted worst, bad, not so bad, good and normal, respectively.”, it sounds better as “For non-progressive diseases, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 denote worst, bad, moderate, good and best (normal), respectively.”</p>	<p>We have made the suggested change in the revised manuscript file.</p>