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General Recommendation: Reconsider after major corrections

Comments to Editor:
The authors have been given detailed requests to revise this manuscript and prepare it as a Review Article. There have been several recent reviews on this topic, and this one is not very good and is difficult to understand. A further concern is that the Figure used have been copied from previous publications.

Comments to Author:
The authors have presented a short Review Article on the topic of noise-induced loudness recruitment and hyperacusis to compare the neurobiological mechanisms. The authors are required to substantively revise this manuscript in the following ways:

1. Please read and follow the Instructions for Authors of this journal and prepare the manuscript as a Review Article. See https://www.medscimonit.com/instructions.
2. A clear and descriptive Title is required. For example - A Review of the Neurobiological Mechanisms that May Distinguish Between Noise-Induced Loudness Recruitment and Hyperacusis.
3. Throughout the manuscript, please remove the term - scoping document - as this is inappropriate. A scoping document typically describes a detailed plan for a body of research.
4. As this is a Review Article, please REMOVE any methods on how you searched the literature. All authors search the literature via PubMed etc., when writing manuscripts, particularly Review Articles.
5. For this journal, a Review Article requires an unstructured Abstract of no more than 250 words in length. The Abstract should include a statement of the background to the review, follow the main topics of the review and should end with a sentence that describes the aims of the review -...... This brief review aims to present the current status of the neurobiological mechanisms that may distinguish between noise-induced loudness recruitment and hyperacusis.
6. After the Abstract, please include Keywords using terms from the Medical Subject Heading MeSH database on the PubMed site http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh. This journal requires that all Review Articles begin with an Introduction section that clearly introduces the main topics of the review - noise-induced hearing loss, loudness recruitment, hyperacusis, the role of the auditory cortex, how associated neurological and neurobiological events have been studied. All statements of fact should be supported by Reference citations.
7. The main Introduction section should end with a statement of the aims of the review...... This brief review aims to present the current status of the neurobiological mechanisms that may distinguish between noise-induced loudness recruitment and hyperacusis.
8. The main review article should be clearly divided into main topic sections with a clear section heading. Within each main section, all statements of fact should be supported by Reference citations.
9. Review Articles should end with a Conclusions section that gives a brief and clear message from the review. For example, -...... This review has shown that although cochlear injury results in abnormal conduction in the auditory nerve, the mechanisms leading to loudness recruitment require further study. However, the nonlinear properties of the basilar membrane are altered by damage to the outer hair cells, leading to abnormal auditory nerve responses that may affect loudness recruitment. However, hyperacusis is associated with compensatory mechanisms within the central CNS and is not always related to auditory damage. Also, hyperacusis may include aversion to sound, which indicates involvement of the limbic system in sound perception.
10. Figures Please only include ORIGINAL Figure images or diagrams. If you copy images from previous publications, you MUST obtain copyright permission from the original publisher, or else you are in legal breach of copyright. None of the Figure images you have included are helpful, so it would be best to remove them.
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General comments to the Authors

The authors have presented a short Review Article on the topic of noise-induced loudness recruitment and hyperacusis to compare the neurobiological mechanisms.

The authors are required to substantively revise this manuscript in the following ways:-

1. Please read and follow the Instructions for Authors of this journal and prepare and format the manuscript as a Review Article. See: https://www.medscimonit.com/instructions

2. A clear and descriptive Title is required. For example: - A Review of the Neurobiological Mechanisms that May Distinguish Between Noise-Induced Loudness Recruitment and Hyperacusis.

3. Throughout the manuscript, please remove the term - scoping document - as this is inappropriate. A scoping document typically describes a detailed plan for a body of research.

4. As this is a Review Article, please REMOVE any methods on how you searched the literature. All authors search the literature via PubMed etc., when writing manuscripts, particularly Review Articles.

5. For this journal, a Review Article requires an unstructured Abstract of no more than 250 words in length. The Abstract should include a statement of the background to the review, follow the main topics of the review and should end with a sentence that describes the aims of the review: - ..... This brief review aims to present the current status of the neurobiological mechanisms that may distinguish between noise-induced loudness recruitment and hyperacusis.

6. After the Abstract, please include Keywords using terms from the Medical Subject Heading (MeSH) database on the PubMed site (http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh).

7. This journal requires that all Review Articles begin with an Introduction section that clearly introduces the main topics of the review - noise-induced hearing loss, loudness recruitment, hyperacusis, the role of the auditory cortex, how associated neurological and neurobiological events have been studied. All statements of fact should be supported by Reference citations. The main Introduction section should end with a statement of the aims of the review..... This brief review aims to present the current status of the neurobiological mechanisms that may distinguish between noise-induced loudness recruitment and hyperacusis.

8. The main review article should be clearly divided into main topic sections with a clear section heading. Within each main section, all statements of fact should be supported by Reference citations.

9. Review Articles should end with a Conclusions section that gives a brief and clear message from the review. For example, - ..... This review has shown that although cochlear injury results in abnormal conduction in the auditory nerve, the mechanisms leading to loudness recruitment require further study. However, the nonlinear properties of the basilar membrane are altered by damage to the outer hair cells, leading to abnormal auditory nerve responses that may affect loudness recruitment. However, hyperacusis is associated with compensatory mechanisms within the central CNS and is not always related to auditory damage. Also, hyperacusis may include aversion to sound, which indicates involvement of the limbic system in sound perception.

10. Figures: Please only include ORIGINAL Figure images or diagrams. If you copy images from previous publications, you MUST obtain copyright permission from the original publisher, or else you are in legal breach of copyright. None of the Figure images you have included are helpful, so it would be best to remove them.

11. If you include any original Figures, the Figure legends should have a clear and descriptive title. Each legend should clearly describe what is being shown in the Figure. All abbreviations should be defined when first used in each Figure legend, so that the reader can understand the Figures when looking at them individually and separate from the main manuscript.

Overall publication value

Message to the Editor (optional)

The authors have been given detailed requests to revise this manuscript and prepare it as a Review Article.

There have been several recent reviews on this topic, and this one is not very good and is difficult to understand.

A further concern is that the Figure used have been copied from previous publications.
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