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

Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijpbs.89526
Published in: Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: 13(4); e89526

Peer Review Report for "The Effect of Memantine Administration on Anxiety Maintenance in Stressed Male Wistar Rats"

Author(s): Ahmad Rafia, Shahrbanoo Oryan, Hedayat Sahraei, Akram Eidi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 19 Jan 2019
Revised Date: 21 Sep 2019
Accepted Date: 21 Dec 2019

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) — 6 Feb 2019

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1- Please, Be read by a native person
2- In the statistical analysis, use the Newman-Keuls multiple comparisons test instead of Tukey
3- Microinjection unilateral or bilateral?
3- Do you have an ethics code? you shouldn't use ketamine for anesthetization because is don't deeply anesthetized. I think you should use thiopental.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 14 Apr 2019

Dear AE,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. The authors should correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 13 May 2019

Dear AE,
This manuscript is well designed and well performed. However, the authors should discuss the method they used and why they did not use the elevated plus-maze method in their study?
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 8 Aug 2019

Dear EIC,
This is with further reference to your paper submitted for possible publication in IJPBS.
The paper has been carefully reviewed and it is suggested that the manuscript requires considerable revision and should be modified according to the reviewers' comments which are appended below.
If the authors can satisfactorily reply to all the points raised by the reviewers, we would be pleased to consider a revised manuscript for further review.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 8 Aug 2019

Dear Author,
Your paper has been evaluated by external peer reviewers. Please do your revisions according to the reviewers' comments. I appreciate you doing the revisions as soon as possible by using the track changes mode in MS Word and using colored text.
After revision authors are obliged to upload reviewers' comments word file in which they have replied to all comments one by one.
Besides, please pay attention to the word count limitation: Word Count (including references and title page) should not be more than 3500 words. Original articles' maximum number of references is 55, Maximum Number of illustrations/Tables is 5. Otherwise, you should pay the extra charge to the publisher.
Word count limits are declared in this link: http://kowsarpub.com/en/index.php/services/for-authors/895-word-count
We look forward to receiving your revised manuscript. Thank you for sending your work to the Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences.
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.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
This manuscript is well designed and well performed. However, the authors should discuss about the method they used and why they did not used elevated plus maze method in their study?

Response: It is suggested in the Introduction and Discussions sections.

Reviewer 2:

1- Please, Be read by a native person

Response: We ask Dr J Shams (Department of Psychiatry, Shahid Behshti Medical University) for English revision of the manuscript.

2- In the statistical analysis, use the Newman-Keuls multiple comparisons test instead of Tukey.

Response: We do it and the results did not changed. It is mentioned in the Method Section.

3- Microinjection unilateral or bilateral?

Response: It was bilateral and it is mentioned in the Method section.

3- Do you have ethics code? You don’t should use from ketamine for anesthetize because is don’t deeply anesthetized. I think you should use thiopental.

Response: The experiment have a code from the Baqiyatallah Medical University, which is mentioned in the Method section. Also, the Ketamine alone is not sufficient for animal anesthesia but when it used in company with another drug such as benzodiazepines or Xylazine (Rompoan) it is sufficient for inducing anesthesia.

Reviewer 3:
No comment

Dear editor a manuscript entitle "Memantine administration in the basolateral amygdala decreases the maintenance of anxiety in stressed male Wistar rats" has been reviewed. The aim of the study is relatively interesting but some of technical points should be considered:

1. The English written of the manuscript is not good and there are a lot of non-sense sentences and mistakes which make difficult to understand.

Response: we ask Dr J Shams (Department of Psychiatry, Shahid Behshti Medical University) for English revision.

2. In introduction section (page 2) the authors mentioned that :

However, as noted in the above sentences, anxiety induced by chronic stress may be long lasting and there is no discussion about the effect of glutamatergic neurotransmission on the maintenance of anxiety induced by chronic stress.

Please see the link:
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0028390814001518

So, it seems that this paragraph should be removed.

Response: It is removed.

3. In method section, the authors mentioned that :

Three groups received different doses of memantine (0.1, 1, 5 and 5 µg /rat; intra-BLA) 5 min before …

For doses, if they have any reference, they should cite in the text.

Response: The reference was added.

4. In statistical analysis section, all ANOVA data should be added in separate table (F value…).

Response: I would like to note that the Journal limitation is 3500 word and the MS in its form is about 6000 word, which needed extra charge! Adding the tables will stile increases the Fee.

5. In this study the authors measure the BDNF level in hippocampus, but if they measure BDNF level in amygdala, perhaps **in this conditions** BDNF level may be differ from those observed.

So, I suggest that the authors consider additional experimental evaluation.

Response: It is suggested in the Discussion section.

6. One may ask about the interpretation of agonist of NMDA receptors on maintenance of anxiety in stressed animals. So the authors should be discus about it.

Response: It is suggested in the Discussion section as well.

7. Overall, Discussion is well-written; however, the findings can be interpreted and discussed better. The interpretations should be in line with the goals and rationale of the study. Please discuss about the non-significant data, including the effects of memantine in different dose.

Response: It is suggested in the Discussion section.

8. It seems that second paragraph of discussion is unnecessary and unrelated to the current study. It is better to remove this paragraph.

Response: The Discussion section is revised and all of the referee's suggestions are considered.

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) 19 Oct 2019

Dear AE,
The authors have done the requested revisions completely and the present version of the manuscript is acceptable for publication.
Thanks.

Hamed Ghazvini: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 1 Dec 2019

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

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 6 Dec 2019

Dear EC,
It is a pleasure to accept this manuscript in its current form for publication in the Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences (IJPBS).
Thank you for the authors' fine contribution.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 21 Dec 2019

Dear Author,
We have completed our review of your manuscript and are pleased to inform you that it is 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 fine contribution. On behalf of the Editors of IJPBS, we look forward to your continued contributions to the Journal.
Thanks.