



OPEN PEER REVIEW REPORT 1

Name of journal: Neural Regeneration Research

Manuscript No: NRR-D-18-00825

Title: The “Brain Stress Timing” phenomenon and other some misinterpretations of randomized clinical trial on Aneurysmal Subarachnoid Hemorrhage

Reviewer’s Name: Peiman Alesheikh

Reviewer’s country: Iran

Date sent for review: 2018-11-28

Date reviewed: 2018-12-05

Review time: 7 days

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is a valuable comparison between coiling and clipping method in cerebrovascular events. But I think that it is better for the scientific weight of the text which the author/s a little bit more comprehensive suggestions and conclusion. Readers should have a wider and more clear horizon about the author/s’ idea and concept about these two different method of treatment.



OPEN PEER REVIEW REPORT 2

Name of journal: Neural Regeneration Research

Manuscript No: NRR-D-18-00825

Title: The “Brain Stress Timing” phenomenon and other some misinterpretations of randomized clinical trial on Aneurysmal Subarachnoid Hemorrhage

Reviewer’s Name: Amit Alexander

Reviewer’s country: India

Date sent for review: 2018-11-28

Date reviewed: 2018-12-02

Review time: 4 days

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is well written and compiled the relevant data but some graphical and tabular content can improve its quality and readability. Also, a proper division of the text in suitable sections is desirable. Apart from this, it is a good piece of work and can be accepted for publication.

OPEN PEER REVIEW REPORT 3

Name of journal: Neural Regeneration Research

Manuscript No: NRR-D-18-00825

Title: The “Brain Stress Timing” phenomenon and other some misinterpretations of randomized clinical trial on Aneurysmal Subarachnoid Hemorrhage

Reviewer’s Name: Olga Chechneva

Reviewer’s country: USA

Date sent for review: 2018-11-28

Date reviewed: 2018-12-10

Review time: 12 days

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript "The "Brain Stress Timing" phenomenon and other some misinterpretations of randomized clinical trial on Aneurysmal Subarachnoid Hemorrhage" is an opinion that discusses the outcomes of the current treatment for aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage. The outcomes of clinical trials using microsurgical clipping vs coiling are compared in general based on the severity of the case, patient survival rate, efficiency of the treatment and re-occurrence of the event. The paper focuses on the pitfalls of the specific clinical trial, ISAT. It discusses the mistakes of the ISAT design and analysis that may cause the misleading conclusion of the study favoring coiling as a preferred method to manage aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage.

The overview is well structured and explains the advantages and disadvantages of both therapeutic approaches. The author emphasizes the importance of multiple aspects such as age, location and condition of the aneurysm for making the decision on the preferred therapeutic approach.

Minor points:

The paper briefly mentions what is "Brain Stress Timing" without supportive facts and possible cellular and molecular mechanism. More detailed characterization of the phenomenon will attract the interest of clinicians and basic scientist to the problem and thus broad the reading audience. However, the authors should control the presence of references along the journal (<12).