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://brief.land/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Gene, Cell and Tissue
Article DOI: 10.5812/gct.101248
Published in: Gene, Cell and Tissue: 7(2); e101248

Peer Review Report for "Antioxidants Can Mitigate Decreased Neurogenesis of Neural Stem Cells During Noise Stress"

Author(s): Mahtab Teimouri, Tayebeh Sanchooli

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 20 Jan 2020
Revised Date: 24 Feb 2020
Accepted Date: 24 Feb 2020

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) — 31 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
I have read the manuscript entitled “Protection of hippocampal neural stem cells during noise stress.” In this letter, the author showed that exposure to noise stress as an environmental stressor can cause some harmful effects such as oxidative stress in CNS. The English language of the manuscript is sufficient. The subject is appropriate and noteworthy. References are new and relevant. This manuscript has the potential to be published in the journal of Gene, Cell, and Tissue.
Kindest Regards

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 2 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
There are a few grammatical errors in the text. The authors should correct them
- I recommend changing the title of manuscript because it is so general.
- It is better you add your result to the manuscript if it is part of your research.

- It's better to replace the antioxidant or oxidative stress in keywords instead of the prenatal or postnatal period.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 3 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
Concerning the manuscript entitled " Protection of hippocampal neural stem cells during noise stress" for Gene, Cell and Tissue Journal.
Final evaluation:
With respect to the authors, the article is recommended to accept after minor revision. Rewriting or doing more research could improve the study.
This manuscript suggested using antioxidant drugs and nutrient antioxidants to suppress the neurogenesis loss of the hippocampus as stress-mediated damage due to noise exposure in pregnant women. Its primary novelty is in its investigation of the use of antioxidants. However, in the present manuscript, they did not consider the safety and efficiency of antioxidants.
There are several issues with this paper:
1- There is much conflicting information in the public domain about the safety and/or efficacy of nutritional supplements during pregnancy. Recommendations are made for pregnant women, taking into account safety data and tolerable upper intakes set for pregnant women. It is important to be able to offer accurate and evidence-based advice on antioxidant use in pregnancy. Routine antioxidants may not be necessary for all, but individuals at risk should be identified. The authors should avoid suggesting antioxidants use in pregnant women without considering their side effects.
2- English editing is highly recommended.
Thanks.

Zahra Heidari: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 4 Feb 2020

Dear EIC,
Based on the reviewers comments this manuscript needs minor revision and a point to point reply to the reviewers.
Thanks.

Zahra Heidari: EIC | **Revision** (0) 4 Feb 2020

Dear Authors,
Based on the reviewers comments this manuscript needs minor revision and a point to point reply to the reviewers.
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.

Dear Editor and Reviewers of journal of Gene, Cell and Tissue

We would like to express our sincerest appreciation and gratitude to the detailed valuable comments of Editor and Reviewer on our manuscript entitled: Protection of hippocampal neural stem cells during noise stress. The suggestions are quite stimulating and helpful for us and we incorporate them in our manubscribe.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

Dear author(s)

There are a few grammatical errors in the text. Please correct them

- It was revised and added to the text.

I recommend change the title of manuscript because it is so general.

- It was revised and added to the text.

Antioxidants Can Mitigate Decreased Neurogenesis Of Neural Stem Cells During Noise Stress

It is better you add your result to the manuscript if it is part of your research.

- Our results and article are under revision and was not published sofar

Its better replace the antioxidant or oxidative stress in key words instead of prenatal or postnatal period.

- It was revised and added to the text.

Reviewer 2:

Dear associate editor

I have read the manuscript entitled “Protection of hippocampal neural stem cells during noise stress.” In this letter the author showed that the exposure to noise stress as an environmental stressor can cause some harmful effects such as oxidative stress in CNS. The english language of the manuscript is sufficient. The subject is appropriate and noteworthy. References are new and relevant. This manuscript has the potential to be published in the journal of Gene, Cell and Tissue.

Kindest Regards

Reviewer 3:

Concerning the manuscript entitled " Protection of hippocampal neural stem cells during noise stress" for Gene, Cell and Tissue Journal.

Final evaluation:

With respect to the authors, the article is recommended to accept after minor revision. Rewriting or doing more research could improve the study.

- It was revised and added to the text.

This manuscript suggested using antioxidant drugs and nutrient antioxidants to suppress the neurogenesis loss of the hippocampus as stress-mediated damage due to noise exposure in pregnant women. Its primary novelty is in its investigation on the use of antioxidants. However, in the present manuscript, they did not consider the safety and efficiency of antioxidants.

There are several issues with this paper:

1- There is much conflicting information in the public domain about the safety and/or efficacy of nutritional supplements during pregnancy. Recommendations are made for pregnant women, taking into account safety data and tolerable upper intakes set for pregnant women. It is important to be able to offer accurate and evidence-based advice on antioxidants use in pregnancy. Routine antioxidants may not be necessary for all, but individuals at risk should be identified. The authors should avoid suggesting antioxidants use in pregnant women without considering their side effects.

- It was revised and added to the text.

. Use of antioxidant drugs is not recommended in pregnant women and also antioxidant supplementary must be used in Recommended Dietary Allowances (RDAs)(1). In conclusion, Plant-based foods antioxidants are very useful and safe for pregnant women and their offspring against noise stress-mediated damages.

2- English editing is highly recommended.

- It was revised and added to the text.

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) 16 Feb 2020

Dear AE
The author (s) have some changes and corrections according to former reviewers. Anyway, reference No. 1 isn't used in the manuscript and the author(s) should consider it.
After doing these minor corrections it may publish in GCT.
Best regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 16 Feb 2020

Dear EIC,
Oops! minor but very important. I could not see reference 1 in this work. The authors should check it and correct it.
Yours

Zahra Heidari: EIC | **Revision** (1) 17 Feb 2020

Dear Authors,
Based on the reviewer comment revisions were done but still minor revision must be done.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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.

Dear reviewers,

Thank you for useful comment, it was a wrong in type of references. It was edited and added to the main text.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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

Zahra Heidari: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 22 Feb 2020

Dear EIC,
Revisions were done well. In a letter to the editor 10 references are allowed. The authors should revise the letter in this regard.
Thanks.

Zahra Heidari: EIC | **Revision** (2) 22 Feb 2020

Dear Authors,
Revisions were done well. In a letter to the editor 10 references are allowed. please revise the letter in this regard.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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.

Dear reviewers,

Thank you for useful comment, it was a wrong in type of references. It was edited and added to the main text.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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

Zahra Heidari: EIC | **Revision** (3) 24 Feb 2020

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