



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_30307
Title of the Manuscript:	Antiretroviral therapy may have angiogenic effect on subjects
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The manuscript contains some interesting data about the possible capability of antiretroviral currently used drugs in producing anxiety. A very testable hypothesis. Authors selected rodents subjected to unique or combined antiretroviral drugs and employed open field test, plus maze test, and light dark test to explore the possibility contained by their hypothesis. In general, the experiment seems well conducted. However, there are some pitfalls in the interpretation of data. In all variables studied in the open field test, authors detected a lowering in locomotor activity that may indicate sedation or a bad physical state of rodents rather than a true anxiogenic effect. On the contrary, in open field test, anxiety is revealed by two constants, the trend of rodents to cross the center of the field but also an increased locomotion and other activities (let us call nervousness). Also in the plus maze test is it not enough the inclusion of the variables explored by authors, is better to use an anxiety index which consider changes in locomotion. I recommend authors to consult the following paper: Current Protocols in Neuroscience 9.45.1-9.45.18, July 2013. Published online July 2013 in Wiley Online Library (wileyonlinelibrary.com). DOI:	Thanks for your kind observation. We used established protocols (Open field test, Light/Dark transition box, and the Elevated plus maze) to investigate anxiety and locomotor. The statistical method used are those recommended in previous works cited in the manuscript. However, we greatly appreciate the reference made to the article of Cohen, Matar, & Joseph in Current protocols in Neuroscience. Their protocol takes into consideration individual differences in response patterns. We shall surely employ that in subsequent research.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	10.1002/0471142301.ns0945s64. (I am not the author). In summary, the statistical analysis and criteria followed in the management of data need a deep revision.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		