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.102247
Published in: Archives of Neuroscience: 7(4); e102247

Peer Review Report for "Association Analysis of Monoamine Oxidase-A Gene Promoter Polymorphism (MAOA uVNTR) for Antisocial Behavior: Absence of the Counting Number Repeats in Central Iran"

Author(s): Maryam Khosravian, Parvaneh Nikpour, Modjtaba Emadi-Baygi, Ali Soleimanpour, Fereidoun Yadollah Moghadam

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 29 Feb 2020
Revised Date: 7 Jun 2020
Accepted Date: 7 Jun 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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 15 Apr 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript needs major revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) — 15 Apr 2020

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.

Dear Dr. Madjid Samii,
Editors-in-Chief of Archives of neuroscience

A revised version of our manuscript entitled “Association analysis of monoamine oxidase-A gene promoter polymorphism (MAOA-uVNTR) for antisocial behavior: Absence of the counting number repeats in Iranian Population” is now ready to be reconsidered for publication in your valuable journal. We highly appreciate the editorial board and referee for their kind suggestions. During the revision time, we eagerly followed their comments and reconstructed the paper to be scientifically valuable for the journal readers.

The answers to the questions raised by the reviewer in this document are indicated by the highlighted ‘green’. We also gave complete and concise answers that accompanied by the corresponding changes in the manuscript using the red font.

We hope the revision and answers are satisfactory to the reviewer and the Editorial board.

Yours

Modjtaba Emadi-Baygi

Response to the reviewers' comments:

Reviewer #1:

In Abstract:

1- The objective should be written as a narrative statement.

2- The number of patients has been exceeded once in the method section. Please exclude the number of patients from the objectives.

3- " and investigate the association between MAOA genotype and risk of violent behavior" is an extra phrase. Please delete it. Insert type of study and statistical analysis.

4- "Alleles with 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 repeats were not observed in any of the two examined groups. ' should be move to results section.

5- Keywords arrange as following:

Antisocial Behavior, MAOA Gene, uVNTR polymorphism

As requested by the reviewer, all the above-mentioned requests have been done and remarked by the red font in the MS.

In Background:

Please insert locus of the MAOA gene.

2- Please correct this statement grammatically "Located in the upstream of the MAOA coding sequence, this polymorphism including a 30-bp variable repeated sequence presenting in 2, 3, 3.5, 4, 5 or 6 copies [8, 9]. "

As requested by the reviewer, all the above-mentioned requests have been done and remarked by the red font in the MS.

In Results:

1- If there is information from cases and controls such as age (youngest, oldest), criminal history, age of onset of delinquency, report at the beginning of results.

2- Please enter the most common and the rarest observed alleles in the body of results.

As requested by the reviewer, all the above-mentioned requests have been done and remarked by the red font in the MS.

In discussion:

1- Please provide a valid reference or valid database to claim that the alleles were new report. How do you claim that alleles were new?

I herewith would like to express my sincere thanks to the reviewer since this request urged us to reconsider our claim and searched the literature again. We do not know the reason but we have missed the corresponding literature, the first one dating back to 2000, in which the researchers reported the fraction numbers of the repeat including 3.5, 4.5, and 5.5 variants in their studies. Due to this, we modified our MS according to the best-matched literature. All the changes remarked by the red font in the MS.

References:

- ✓ References are old. Please provide some new references.

As requested by the reviewer, we added new references including the recent ones.

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.

Hossein Teimori: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 3 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1- In Title, please replace " Iranaian population" with " in central Iran".
2- "our study calls for a further population-based study in the Iranian population including longitudinal studies in the normal population"
Above sentence is similar in the Abstract and conclusion. On the other hand, it is a universal term and can be used for any polymorphism. At least remove it from the abstract.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 4 Jun 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript still needs minor revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 4 Jun 2020

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

Response to the reviewers' comments:

Reviewer #1:

1- In Title, please replace "Iranaian population" with "in central Iran".

2- "Our study calls for a further population-based study in the Iranian population including longitudinal studies in the normal population" Above sentence is similar in the Abstract and conclusion. On the other hand, it is a universal term and can be used for any polymorphism. At least remove it from the abstract.

As requested by the reviewer, all the above-mentioned requests have been done and remarked by the red font in the MS.

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.

Hossein Teimori: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 7 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 7 Jun 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 7 Jun 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.