		PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS					ASSESSMENT INFORMATION		DRUG EFFECT					
Study (year)	Participants Group allocation	Drug name	Route of administration	Data collection	Data analysis		n Age [yrs]	Ratio Men	Ratio Complete SCI	Ratio Paraplegic SCI	Time since injury [yrs]	Name	Timing	
Bracken (1990)	† 171 Placebo † 162 Intervention	Methylprednisolone	philip			0 2 D	20 40 60	0.8	0.6	NR NR	A	Neurological (motor and sensory)	A, 6w, 6m	†
Bracken (1990)	† 171 Placebo † 154 Intervention	Naloxone	philip			D		0.8	0.6	NR NR	A	Neurological (motor and sensory)	A, 6w, 6m	Ø
	† 171 Placebo † 162 Intervention		NR			D		0.8	0.6	NR NR	A	Neurological (motor and sensory)	6w, 6m, 1y	timing
	† 171 Placebo † 154 Intervention		NR			D		0.8	0.6	NR NR	A	Neurological (motor and sensory)	6w, 6m, 1y	Ø
	† 171 Placebo † 162 Intervention		NR			D		0.8	0.6	NR NR	A	Neurological (motor and sensory)	6w, 6m, 1y	Ø
	† 171 Placebo † 154 Intervention		NR			D		0.8	0.6	NR NR	A	Neurological (motor and sensory)	6w, 6m, 1y	Ø
	† NR No treatment Intervention						36	NR NR	0	0	A	Neurological (motor and sensory)	A(H), A(R), D(R), 1y, 2y ****	Ø
Tsutsumi (2006)	† 33 No treatment Intervention	Methylprednisolone	NR	NR			50	0.9	0.8	NR NR	A	Neurological (motor)	A, 6w, 6m	subgroups
Maric (2008)	† 12 Group 1 † 12 Group 2	Levodopa Levodopa					51	0.6	0	0.4	8 weeks 8 weeks	Neurological (motor), functional (mobility and general)	weekly	Ø
Clark (2008)	† 530 † 480 No treatment † 50 Intervention	Testosterone					36	1	0.5	0.5	A	Neurological (motor), functional (general)	D	subgroups, assessments
Ito (2009)	† 79 † 41 No treatment † 38 Intervention	Methylprednisolone			NR		55	0.8	0.3	0.3	A	Neurological (motor), injury severity	A, 3m	Ø
Casha (2012)	† 25 Placebo † 27 Intervention	Minocycline	, stilligh				41	0.7	0.6	0.6	A	Neurological (motor and sensory), functional (general)	neurological: 1d, 4d, 5d, 7d, 3w, 6w, 12w, 6m, 12m functional: 6w, 12w, 26w, 52w	Ø
Felleiter (2012)	† 128 No treatment † 98 Intervention	Methylprednisolone	NR			0		D	NR NR	NR NR	A	Neurological (motor), injury severity	not precisely reported	Ø
Thompson (2013)	† 12) Pre vs. Post	Cyproheptadine					51	0.8	0	0.8	C	Neurological (motor), functional (mobility and spasticity)	pre drug, 4.5h after drug	assessments
Thompson (2013)	† 12) † 12 Pre vs. Post	Escitalopram					51	0.8	0	0.8	©	Neurological (motor), functional (mobility and spasticity)	pre drug, 4.5h after drug	assessments
Leech (2014)	10) 10 Pre vs. Post	Cyproheptadine					44	1	0	1	G	Neurological (motor), electrophysiology, functional (mobility and spasticity)	pre drug, 4.5h after drug	assessments
Leech (2014)	† 10 X † 10 Pre vs. Post	Escitalopram					44	1	0	1	C	Neurological (motor), electrophysiology, functional (mobility and spasticity)	pre drug, 4.5h after drug	assessments
	†1555 No treatment †44 Intervention						46	0.8	0.3	0.5	A	Neurological (motor)	A(R), D(R)	Ø
	† 32 Placebo † 32 Intervention		174				42	0.6	NR NR	0.2	A	Neurological (motor and sensory)	3d, 6d, 3m, 6m	assessments
	† 151 No treatment Intervention						42	0.7	0.3	0.5	A	Neurological (motor), functional (mobility)	A(H), A(R), D(R)	Ø
	† 54 No treatment Intervention		NR				40	0.7	0.6	0	A	Neurological (motor), injury severity	<8d, 1-3m, 3-6m, 6-12m	assessments
Cragg (2019)	† 536 No treatment † 115 Intervention	Baclofen				0 2	20 40 60	0.8 D	0.7 D	0.8 D	4 weeks 4 weeks	Neurological (motor and sensory), injury severity	4w, 1y	Ø