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://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

IJ Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.5812/ijpbs-122961
Published in: IJ Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: 16(3); e122961

Peer Review Report for "Controversial Effects of Diverse Types of *Toxoplasma gondii* on the Anxiety-like Behavior and Cognitive Impairments in the Animal Model of Alzheimer's Disease"

Author(s): Tahereh Mikaeili Galeh, Hamed Ghazvini, Shahabeddin Sarvi, Moslem Mohammadi, Hossein Asgarian-Omran, Fatemeh Hajizadeh, soheil azizi, Ahmad Daryani

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	29 Jan 2022
Revised Date:	19 Apr 2022
Accepted Date:	28 May 2022

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) 11 Feb 2022

Dear AE,

This paper has the potential to be accepted, but some important points have to be clarified before proceeding.

- In Page 6 Line 111, please write decimal numbers correctly. Write 1/2 & 1/3 according to the English writing 1.2 & 1.3, respectively.

- The figure legend of Figure 1 (Timeline) needs revision. Abbreviations should be defined in its figure legend.

- It is stated that the rats were on a 12-hour light/dark cycle. When were the rats injected and evaluated for the behavioral tests concerning the light cycle?

The brand and country of origin for "human Aβ1-42 peptide" should be mentioned in the method section.

- Please define which task of MWM is used to assess spatial learning and which one is used to assess spatial memory in the method section.

- Reference 1 in the reference list of the manuscript seems currently incomplete. It appears

that the journal name and further information are missing.

Kind regards,

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 19 Feb 2022

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to the comments this manuscript needs minor revision.
Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 19 Feb 2022

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:

Q1: In the title section, add anxiety-like behavior in keywords, and the title
Q2: In the method, point 3.1. the first line in the animal section includes an ethics statement and guidelines for laboratory care and use.
Q3: In the results section, specify which of the two methods of repeated measure of ANOVA used for analyzing the variables (two-way or one-way).
Q4: line 89, point 3.2/experimental design: what was the reason for not including T. gondii groups without Alzheimer's?
Q5: in discussion: Given that one of the strengths of this study was the combined use of three different strains of T. gondii on AD, therefore need that the authors more explain about the interaction of this strain in combination with cognitive function.

Kind regards.

Maryam Sefidgarnia Amiri: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 6 Apr 2022

Dear EIC,

I received comments from reviewers who have expertized on the manuscript. Although the reviewers found strengths in your paper, they also identified some concerns and believed that the paper needs some revisions. I conclude due to the importance of the subject, the manuscript has the potential of consideration for publication after satisfactorily addressing reviewers' concerns. Therefore, I invite the authors to reply to the reviewers' comments and resubmit the revised manuscript for further review.
My decision is a minor revision.

Kind regards,
AE

Mehran Zarghami: EIC | **Revision** (0) 14 Apr 2022

Dear Authors,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript for consideration for publication in the Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences. External peer reviewers have evaluated your paper. Please revise it according to their comments. I would appreciate it if you could do the revisions as soon as possible.

After revision, authors are obliged to upload reviewers' comments in a Word file in which they reply to each comment individually. Please note that the full manuscript file must be highlighted to indicate revised texts.

Besides, please pay attention to the word count limitation:
Word count limits are declared in this link: https://brieflands.com/journals/ij-psychiatry-and-behavioral-sciences/knowledgebase/category/tree#word_count_limits

We look forward to receiving your revised manuscript. Thank you for sending your work to the Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences.

Kind Regards,
EIC

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 the Editor:

We thank you and the anonymous reviewers for the meticulous and rapid review of our article on **" *Controversial Effects of Diverse Types of Toxoplasma gondii on Cognitive Impairments in the Animal Model of Alzheimer's Disease* ".**

We have revised the manuscript according to the suggestions and highlighted the textual changes in yellow. A reply to the specific comments raised by the reviewers is mentioned below.

Reviewer 2

Q 1
In Page 6 Line 111, please write decimal numbers correctly. Write 1/2 & 1/3 according to the English writing 1.2 & 1.3, respectively.

R: Thanks for critically reading and valuable comments of respected reviewer, it should be noted that the "/" symbol is not a decimal symbol but is a fraction symbol. However, in order to respect the comment of the honorable reviewer and to remove the ambiguity of the sentence, the relevant numbers have been rewritten in decimal and highlighted in the text of the manuscript.

Q 2
The figure legend of Figure 1 (Time line) needs revision. Abbreviations should be defining in its figure legend.

R: Based on your valuable comments, revisions have been made and highlighted to the figure legend of Figure 1. Abbreviations are also included in the figure legend.

Q 3
It is stated that the rats were on a 12 h light/dark cycle. When were the rats injected and evaluated for the behavioral tests with respect to the light cycle?

R: With respect to the light cycle, rats were injected and underwent behavioral tests from 08:00 AM to 12:00 MD.

Q 4

Brand and country of origin for "human Aβ1-42 peptide" should be mentioned in method section.

R: Based on your valuable comments, brand and country of origin for "human Aβ1-42 peptide" have been included and highlighted in the method section.

Q 5

Please define which task of MWM is used to assess the spatial learning and which one is used to assess the spatial memory in method section.

R: Based on your valuable comments, revisions have been made and highlighted to the method section, separately.

Q 6

Reference 1 in the reference list of manuscript seems currently incomplete. It appears that the journal name and further information is missing.

R: Reference 1 was carefully reviewed, it should be noted that this reference is related to the book and its information is completely entered and does not need to be revised.

Reviewer 3

Q1: In the title section, add anxiety-like behavior in keywords and title

R: Thanks for critically reading and valuable comments of respected reviewer, revisions have been made and highlighted to the title and keywords sections.

Q2: In the method, point 3.1. first line in the animal section, include ethics statement and guidelines

R: Based on your valuable comments, the ethics statement and guidelines have been included and highlighted in first line of point 3.1. in the method section.

Q3: In the results section, specify which of the two methods of repeated measure of ANOVA used for analyzing the variables (two-way or one-way).

R: Based on your valuable comments, the one-way ANOVA or two-way ANOVA analysis is included in the results sections and revisions have been highlighted.

Q4: line 89, point 3.2/experimental design: what was the reason for not including T. gondii groups without Alzheimer?

R: Given that the main purpose of our study was to investigate the effect of infection with different strains of T. gondii on the course of AD and the study was conducted to clarify this ambiguity of whether T. gondii infection with different strains exacerbates or improves cognitive impairments in AD. Therefore, there was no requirement for the presence of T. gondii groups without Alzheimer and the presence of them in the study was beyond our aim.
It should be noted that the presence of groups without T. gondii and Alzheimer (Sham and Vehicle), unlike parasitic groups without Alzheimer was necessary to be compared with other groups, as well to statistical analysis.

Q5: in discussion: Given that one of the strengths of this study was the combined use of three different strain of T. gondii on AD, therefore need that authors more explain about the interaction of this strain in combination on cognitive function.

R: Based on your valuable comments, additional explanations about the effect of the combined strains of T. gondii on cognitive function have been included and highlighted in the discussion section.

The respected editor, we tried to improve the manuscript as reviewers comments. If there are other comments we are ready to perform them.

With the best regards, sincerely yours

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) — 1 May 2022

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 1 May 2022

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

Maryam Sefidgarnia Amiri: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 16 May 2022

Dear EIC,

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

Kind regards,
AE

Mehran Zarghami: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 28 May 2022

Dear Authors,

We have completed our review of your manuscript and are pleased to inform you that it is being considered for publication in the IJPBS. Note that the publication of your article will only be finalized upon your cooperation with the editorial processing.
Thank you for your kind contribution. On behalf of the Editors of IJPBS, we look forward to your continued contributions to the Journal.

Kind regards,
EIC