

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_99709
Title of the Manuscript:	Postnatal Effects of the Ethanol on the Encephalon Mass and Neocortex Architecture in Wistar Rat Offspring Submitted to Acute Prenatal Injection [E12] and in vitro Ethanol Effects on Wistar Rat and Human Erythrocytes
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalindj.com/index.php/INDJ/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Actually, a lot of the data obtained by the authors in the current manuscript are already known, and even new explanations weren't given. So the manuscript might have some methodology value but not scientific one.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. No. Abstract should be rearranged according to general rules: thus, study design has to describe the groups, treatments, outcomes – like steps of study performing. Place and Duration of Study – this information is useless here. Methodology – very few information is given. What was the outcome, when was the data collected, which type of data?</p> <p>4. In general, yes. But the section Study design should be added to the Methods section.</p> <p>5. In general, yes, but a lot of the data are already known. In particular, the effects of NaCl different concentrations on erythrocyte membrane stability are very well-known, as well as ethanol ones, it absolutely wasn't necessary to repeat this study. Then, adding the task of erythrocytes stability looks artificial, because there is no obvious relation between study on rats and erythrocyte membrane stability: as the authors mentioned, red blood cell quite differs from the nuclear cell, so if they would like to extrapolate some results obtained on erythrocytes to the membrane stability of neurons – such extrapolation wouldn't be valid.</p> <p>6. There is excessive reference list. Then, there is excessive citation of old literature (from the last century) and very small number of relevant works. Thus, only 6 out of 83 refs are for the last 5 years (2019-2023), and no one for the last 3 years (2021-2023). The reference list should be upgraded.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Spelling and grammar should be checked and corrected!</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. Keywords. Biomathematics – this keyword has no sense here. If the authors meant statistics – they didn't use something extraordinary to be mentioned in the keyword list.</p> <p>2. Effects of ethanol on erythrocytes – it is already studied very widely.</p> <p>3. Study design should be described more carefully: thus, it is understandable that 12 pregnant rats received 3 injections of ethanol (and 6 received saline) on E12, and some litters were taken on P8, and that's it. The task described in the last paragraph of 2.1 section is absolutely unclear: were there other rats than those served as a control in the main task? Had they received some ethanol and BrdU injections, and if so - when? How many litters were taken on the mentioned days? Why weren't these timepoints used in the main study?</p> <p>4. Fig.4 – should be in a better resolution: in A-D,F graphs the axis numbers are invisible, so it is impossible to compare the curves. C-D – it looks like sigmoidal curve would fit better. E – this graph has no sense: what does every point in this graph mean? The numbers on X-axis and the ones on Y-axis are dedicated to different animals, what common is between them? And if R is so small – that means that there is no relation and the approximation is invalid. What does p=0.05 mean in this case? F – according to the graph, there is no difference in brain mass between treated and control animals. But the opposite is indicated in the abstract and conclusion.</p> <p>5. Discussion 4.1: according to the cited literature ([65-67]), the acute effects of ethanol on neocortex development have already been investigated. So, what is the novelty of this study?</p> <p>6. Discussion 4.2: as no changes in brain mass were observed in the current study, it is expected that such discrepancy with the literature data would be explained. But no explanation was given in this section.</p> <p>7. Discussion 4.3: all the information and suggestions provided in this section are well-known.</p> <p>8. Conclusion. The authors stated that "the ethanol injection in the rats shows ... decrease of brain mass, relative to the control", but it is in controversy with the results. Then, a lot of states in the conclusion are the suggestions based on the literature – the authors should know that Conclusion section should include THE CONCLUSIONS BASED ON THEIR OWN RESULTS ONLY!</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Halyna Kuznietsova
Department, University & Country	Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine