OPEN PEER REVIEW

Open Peer Review (OPR)

As a new feature for progressing towards transparency, we decided to open a new window for all of our editors as well as authors titled "**Open Peer Review**". We hope by this new facility, our reviewers will be more motivated and authors will be more satisfied with the review process. We believe that publishing our peer review reports could make a transparent and clear environment for all our efforts within a journal, but not all reviewers tend to publish their comments.

What is "Open Peer Review" process?

An "Open Peer Review" process is making the details of all review process (including reviewers, associate editors, and EICs comments) as "Public" as it is agreed by EIC, Authors, and reviewers.

Advantages of "Open Peer Review" process

- More transparency, constructiveness and tactful comments of the peer review process: leads to an increase in the quality of reviews
- More motivations for all involved roles in the review process
- Authors' satisfactions from the review process: Increases honesty between authors and reviewers
- Education of both authors and new students
- Prevents reviewers from following their individual agendas and leading to the detection of reviewers' conflicts of interests

You can find out more at:
https://sites.kowsarpub.com/kowsar/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Archives of Neuroscience
Article DOI: 10.5812/ans.79812
Published in: Archives of Neuroscience: 7(1); e79812

Peer Review Report for "Can Adult Neurogenesis Be Considered as Neuroplasticity?"

Author(s): Hamidreza Famitafreshi, Morteza Karimian

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 27 May 2018
Revised Date: 31 Jan 2019
Accepted Date: 23 Oct 2019

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Reviewer | Revision (0)

17 Jan 2019

Dear AE,

The evidences, those were cited in this review article doesn't support the overall conclusion that " Neuroplasticity could be used for neurogenesis ".

As the authors previously discussed, It is now accepted that adult neurogenesis occurs in dentate gurus and in the periventricular zone in humans and most mammals. Recent studies quantified the number of cells which express neuronal precursor markers of neuroblasts, they have confirmed the existence of neuroblasts in the aforementioned regions (1-3), but another study has shown that less than one percent of neurons of olfactory bulbs exchange over a century (4) and other study revealed the declining the number of neuroblasts with increasing age (2).

It is not clear if this minor extent of neurogenesis has an overall impact on functional state and neuroplasticity.

The authors didn't account for all the data in the cellular domain in this regard and they haven't provided enough logical arguments to establish this conclusion.

References:

1. Knoth et al., 2010, R. Knoth, I. Singec, M. Ditter, G. Pantazis, P. Capetian, R.P. Meyer, V. Horvat, B. Volk, G. Kempermann, Murine features of neurogenesis in the human hippocampus across the lifespan from 0 to 100 years

PLoS ONE, 5 (2010), p. e8809
2. N. Sanai, T. Nguyen, R.A. Ihrie, Z. Mirzadeh, H.H. Tsai, M. Wong, N. Gupta, M.S. Berger, E. Huang, J.M. Garcia-Verdugo, et al, Corridors of migrating neurons in the human brain and their decline during infanc, Nature, 478 (2011), pp. 382-386
3. C. Wang, F. Liu, Y.-Y. Liu, C.-H. Zhao, Y. You, L. Wang, J. Zhang, B. Wei, T. Ma, Q. Zhang, et al. Identification and characterization of neuroblasts in the subventricular zone and rostral migratory stream of the adult human brain
Cell Res., 21 (2011), pp. 1534-1550
4. O. Bergmann, J. Liebl, S. Bernard, K. Alkass, M.S. Yeung, P. Steier, W. Kutschera, L. Johnson, M. Landén, H. Druid, et al.The age of olfactory bulb neurons in humans
Neuron, 74 (2012), pp. 634-639
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 30 Jan 2019

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some major revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 30 Jan 2019

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs major revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Hello dear editor

Date: 30/1/2019

We would like to thank the reviewer for his thoughtful review of the manuscript. He/she raised important issues and his/her inputs are very helpful for improving the manuscript. We agree with almost all their comments and we have revised our manuscript accordingly. Moreover, we are including all reviewer' suggestions and clarifying the text when needed. We are confident that the new version of the manuscript will be greatly improved. We respond below in detail to each of the reviewer's comments. We hope that the reviewer will find our responses to their comments satisfactory, and we are willing to finish the revised version of the manuscript including any further suggestion that the reviewer may have. To facilitate the work of the reviewers, we have marked the changes as red.

Reviewer 1

It is well-known that Neurogenesis occur in some parts of brain areas. We agree that in olfactory bulb the Neurogenesis is not considerable. Also It should be noted that we have discussed Neurogenesis under stressful condition and therefore we expect marked Neurogenesis after stress to happen. As you mentioned Neurogenesis in normal condition is a quiescent phenomena. We added your proposed references to the article and a part to the conclusion to confirm your opinion.

We hope your positive response in this regard
Thanks

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 19 Oct 2019

Dear AE,
The ambiguities which were mentioned before, have been partially resolved and from my point of view except for some grammatical errors, it could be considered for publication.
Regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 23 Oct 2019

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 23 Oct 2019

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.