

Effect of sidestream cigarette smoking on memory of male Long-Evans rats.

Begum A et al. (dr.aminabegum.bsmmu@gmail.com)

Mechanical review

Comments (07-Sep-23)	Author's response (14-Sep-23)
1. Submit an EQUATOR checklist.	1. Submitted appropriate EQUATOR checklist.
2. Table 3 does not qualify to be a stand-alone table. Remove it.	2. Removed Table 3.
3. Follow author instructions, especially for line numbers, word count, ORCID, and email IDs of authors,	3. Revised the manuscript according to the author's instruction. Given line numbers, word counts in title page, ORCID and email id of all authors.

Round 1**Technical review**

Reviewer's information			
Date review assigned	16-Jan-24	Date review completed	31-Jan-24
Reviewer name	Fakhrul Islam Khaled	Do you have any conflict of interest with the author/s?	No
ORCID	0000-0002-1003-6598	Do you wish to be disclosed to the author?	Yes
Reviewer's comments (5-Feb-24)		Author's response (29-Feb-24)	
<p>1. Title, objective, method, result, discussion are well aligned and well stated.</p> <p>2. Abstract, introduction, rationality, statistical design & analysis – all parts are well written.</p> <p>3. However, in discussion the following recommendations may be considered: Relevant recent more studies need to be discussed.</p> <p>Pathophysiological mechanism of cognitive impact of side stream smoking may be stated.</p> <p>Importance and impact of this study findings in human – to be mentioned with further study directives.</p> <p>These additive corrections may improve the article's acceptance, impact & citation score.</p>		<p>[Please write a response below. You must change the manuscript as per your response. Mention line numbers.]</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>Relevant recent articles entered.</p> <p>Given the line.</p> <p>Given in the discussion.</p>	
Reviewer's Recommendation			
		Revisions Required	

Responsible Editor's comments (5-Feb-24)		Author's response (29-Feb-24)	
Name	M Mostafa Zaman	[Please write a response to each points. You must change the manuscript as per your response. Mention line numbers.]	
ORCID	0000-0002-1736-1342		
<p>1. Please reduce the word count to 250 or less. Currently, it is 291.</p> <p>2. Highlights are shown smoking's impact on society but the experiment is on rats. Please do not claim anything beyond the data of the study. Prepare at least two bullets based on the findings on rates as given in the Conclusion.</p>		<p>1. Reduced the word count of abstract 258.</p> <p>2. Revised the "Highlights" now looks as below:</p> <p>a. Sidestream cigarette smoking was done by Cigarette smoke exposure system (CIM Scientific Co, Bangladesh), a customized device.</p> <p>b. Memory assessment was done by Morris water maze test, a widely used instrument.</p>	

<p>3. The Introduction is heavier on the human side. Reduce it and increase the weight of the studies done on experimental animals. Otherwise, the literature review appears incomplete/inadequate.</p> <p>4. One reference would suffice for line 138 of the Methods section.</p> <p>5. Page 6: Please add a flow chart to depict the trials 1-4 and the final one at 44 days. Samples are available in the EQUATOR website. This is essential to make the trial description better readable and understandable. The current description is lengthy (the paragraph took more than one page). Spit them into two small paragraphs with the aid of the flowchart. Reference to Tables 1 & 2 here is not warranted because these tables provide the results of the study.</p> <p>6. Statistical analysis: Is it the convention to use SEs instead of SDs in the trials? If not, provide SDs. Please.</p> <p>7. Results: Table 2b is not suitable to stand alone as a table. Please merge it with Table 2a (and renumber the tables as Table 2. Every time the results are given, the statistical methods and interpretation of the results are given. I see four such descriptions on page 8.</p> <p>8. You could simply provide the P value in the parenthesis with a claim of statistical significance. I advise the authors to follow any high-quality reference article in their reference list.</p> <p>9. The first paragraph of the Discussion should reiterate the main findings of the study rather than reiterating the methods in a full paragraph.</p> <p>10. Prove one paragraph on the strengths and limitations just before the Conclusion.</p> <p>11. Meo number and the date of funding to be given (line 274).</p> <p>12. Table Table 1: Provide the number of animals in these two groups; the footnote should have clarifications on Trials 1-4. Indicate if the numbers in parenthesis are ranges.</p> <p>Table 2: Add another row for day 44 to cover the contents of Table 2a. Then remove Table 2b. What do the esterics mean?</p> <p>Table 3: What do the esterics mean? What are the numbers in parentheses? provide clarifications in the footnote.</p>	<p>c. We should be aware of the negative effects of sidestream cigarette smoking.</p> <p>3. Introduction is reduced (2 to 28) and rat brain is almost similar to human brain, mostly difference in size.</p> <p>4. Reference is increased in number, ref. 17 to 25 (49 to 111).</p> <p>5. Add a flow chart (line 48).</p> <p>6. In animal study, mean \pm SEM (Standard error of mean) is widely used instead of SDs.</p> <p>7. Table 2a and 2b are merged in one table (325-326) and correct the table footnote.</p> <p>8. Simply p value in parenthesis is add (308-311, 327-329, 350-352).</p> <p>9. Corrected in 131-135.</p> <p>10. Limitation adds in 154-158.</p> <p>11. Not available.</p> <p>12. Corrected the Table's footnote (309-312, 328-330, 351-353)</p>
Editor's Decision	Major Revision

Round 2

Responsible Editor's comments (3-Mar-24)		Author's response (14-Mar-24)
Name	M Mostafa Zaman	[Please write a response to each points. You must change the manuscript as per your response. Mention line numbers.]
ORCID	0000-0002-1736-1342	
<p>The manuscript has improved but several points are unaddressed. The Point-by-Point response has not been given. Therefore, our understanding of your revision is incomplete and incomprehensible.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The title and abstract pages should be separated. 2. The is no line numbers. 3. Highlights: we need at least two bullets, but nothing should be claimed beyond the data of the study. 4. Tables 1-4: Description of results in the footnote should be avoided. Some of the texts could be taken to the Results section if needed. 5. Table 3: This does not deserve to be a standalone table. Merge this with Table 2 using two separate subheadings for escape latency and target crossing. 6. The figure 1 is a flowchart, not a work plan. 		<p>Uploaded the point-by-point response.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Uploaded separate title and abstract. 2. Provided line number. 3. Revised the highlights. 4. Major findings of the tables were described and rest were referred to the respective table. 5. Merged the table. 6. Revised.
Editor's Decision		Minor Revision

Final decision of the Executive Editor (14-Mar-24)	ACCEPT We shall edit the manuscript soon.
---	---