Course of the Short Note sn20251202-5r

Short Note submitted on: Wednesday July 30, 2025

Editorial response: Saturday September 27, 2025

Subject: Short Note 5 – Major Revision requested after peer review

Dear Author(s),

Following peer review, your Short Note 5, entitled “Impact of social and personalized visual enrichment on stereotypic behaviors in rhesus macaque monkeys in the laboratory: a case study”, requires major revisions.

Please carefully address the reviewers’ comments point by point, and resubmit your revised manuscript via your personal FC3R account:

• All responses must be entered in the “Response to reviewers” field, which displays the full text of the reviewers’ comments.

• When responding, clearly indicate how each comment has been addressed in the Short Note, specifying the relevant line number or figure/table legend, or provide a reasoned explanation if you disagree.

• For clarity, insert a line break after each reviewer comment and begin your reply with: **Response:** followed by your answer.

• You must upload the revised version of your manuscript and submit it via the platform to trigger a new review cycle. The same reviewers will be invited to evaluate the revised version.

We thank you for your collaboration and look forward to your revised submission.

Sincerely,
Marc Le Bert
Short Notes Editorial Team

QUALITY OF WRITING

Reviewer 1 ticked : yes
Reviewer 1 comment :
The short note is well written. The objective are clearly stated.
It is understandable to non-specialists and could be of interest for a large audience, beyond researchers working with non-human primates.
The text and approach are easy to follow.
I would suggest to use AWB for the Animal Welfare Body in the supp. Material as it is referred to in the main manuscript.

Reviewer 2 ticked : yes
Reviewer 2 comment :
This Short Note is understandable to non-specialists and well explained.
The format and instructions are respected.
The text and approach are understandable and easy to follow.
However, the dataset contains little number of sessions and the results cannot always be interpreted.

QUALITY OF FIGURES AND ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS

Reviewer 1 ticked : no
Reviewer 1 comment :
The figures are correct to support the explanations in the text, and the attached files are properly referenced in the manuscript.
Statistics are not integrated into figures, since there were no statistical tests performed. However, it would have been interesting to have the details on the non-stereotypical behaviors, and which ones are maintained in the absence of the partner ("survival"-type behaviors?).
Figure 1B could have been reproduced together with Figures 2A and 2B to show the 3 conditions (with partner/without partner without enrichment/without partner with enrichment), maybe using a different type of graph.
Non-stereotypical behaviors could be represented on Figure 2C and separated in more detailed categories (at least : passive vs active non-stereotypical behaviors).

Reviewer 2 ticked : no
Reviewer 2 comment :
The figures could gain precision, here are some suggestions:
- Figures 1.B, 2.A and 2.B would gain in clarity by stating the values on it. A dot plot would be appreciated to see the sessions differences
- It would be interesting to have a bar plot for 2.A and 2.B to ease the comparison between both.
- The non-stereotypic behaviors could also be integrated in the figures as described in the text (as different shades of green for example)
- For figure 2.C, it would be interesting to see this distribution through the sessions and versus a control

The resolution of the images is sufficient.
No statistics or std are integrated in the figures.
The legends are clear.

QUALITY OF THE EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

Reviewer 1 ticked : no
Reviewer 1 comment :
Given the context in which this study has been designed, a qualitative analysis has been done. It would have been useful to have more information on the current status of the pair, to know if more data can be collected at this time to complete the data set and allow for statistical analysis. In any case, the study has been well conducted with data collected with partner/with and without video enrichment. More days of data acquisition could have strengthened the results.
The authors have mentioned the role of the monkey's personality in the lack of success on the long term of the video enrichment. Are there some other enrichments that could be tested on this monkey (or at least, could be discussed in the short note) like : video enrichment displayed when the monkey has access to the whole housing space (even though the video monitor cannot be moved around, it could reduce the stress)/videos displaying other monkeys or different video of the partner, engaged in various types of behaviors/positive vocalisations' display/active viewing allowing for the monkey to choose to watch the video or not/videos displaying other animals or humans?
Another control could have been to test video enrichment in the presence of the partner.

Reviewer 2 ticked : no
Reviewer 2 comment :
There are no statistical analyses due to the limited number of session (as stated line 360), thus I cannot evaluate the precision, robustness and validity of the study.
It is also stated that monkey N "moved in the lower part of the cage (22% of the time on average), making him invisible in the videos" (line 328), resulting in a considerable loss of data and introducing a wide margin of error in the interpretability of the data.
On presenting videos of unfamiliar macaques to monkey N, which could be received as a useful and valid control, the authors stated "No quantitative data were collected for this observation. However, it was visually noted that monkey N did not show any particular interest in the video."(lines 142-143). I would strongly recommend the authors to quantify this observation in order to compare it to the collected data in order to lay conclusion on it.
Another point that is unclear to me is that the monkey N seems to be less stressed in its home enclosure than in the Allentown cage in which the experimental observations are done - why are these documentations not done in its home enclosure? While expected, this observation is again not quantified enough in the study to be used for discussion "Moreover, we observed that monkey N spent less time performing stereotypic behaviors when alone in his home enclosure compared to the reduced space (Supplementary material, section #2). Although this observation is based on a

single experimental session [...]" (lines 161-163)

On the overall, I would recommend to the authors:
- to collect more data in the presence and absence of the partner monkey to add sessions and increase the N of sessions. This would allow the authors to do statistical tests.
- to have a wider field of view of the monkey N when filming his behavior in the cage as he is viewing the videos to be able to quantify his behavior throughout the whole session.

QUALITY OF THE REPORTING

Reviewer 1 ticked : yes
Reviewer 1 comment :
Materials and methods section is sufficiently detailed to allow experiments to be repeated.
The raw data are not showed, but authors explained the methods used to get and analyse the data.

Reviewer 2 ticked : yes
Reviewer 2 comment :
The experiments details are very well explained and clear to be replicated.
The data treatment is well detailed.
There is no mention of code/data sharing, highly recommended in the guidelines.

FINAL REVIEWERS DECISIONS

Reviewer 1 final decision : to be discussed
Reviewer 1 final comment :
I would like to acknowledge the thought process carried out by the authors and the AWB of the lab for the implementation of the refinement element described in this document to help alleviate the stress triggered by the separation from a partner during work sessions. This is a frequent situation in non-human primates'lab and it is of great interest to communicate on what is developed to help find solutions, even though, like in this case, it was not successful.
I would suggest to add some information on the current context, as well as suggestions to implement other solutions to improve the animal well-being/welfare. If possible, it would be great to include more data from the whole homecage (using a second videocam) to increase the number of observations, as well as some control (see previous section).

Reviewer 2 final decision : to be discussed
Reviewer 2 final comment :

This short note reports a case study of refinement to improve the welfare of a paired macaque who shows signs of stereotypical behavior in the absence of his partner, gone for about an hour for experimental purposes. The work documented here has been done in margin of other protocols and proposes to show videos of the absent macaque to the one remaining alone in the home cage. While the macaque viewing the videos shows interest at first, decreasing the stereotypical behavior, the authors report a non-lasting effect.
However, to my point point of view, this dataset remains uncomplete. The matter of refinement and stress reduction is of higher matter in animal research, and the authors proposed an interesting idea; I thereby strongly recommend the authors of this case study to add more data and conduct statistical analyses to enhance its robustness.

Author's response: Saturday November 08, 2025

We thank the Short Notes Editorial Team for allowing us to submit a revised version of our manuscript. We also thank the two reviewers who evaluated our work. We are pleased to note their positive opinion regarding our approach to attempting to reduce stress in the animal in question in this work.

We have revised the manuscript to address most of their comments and suggestions. In particular, we have provided more details regarding the data we report, as requested by reviewer #1. Overall, we believe this has improved the clarity and quality of the manuscript.

However, we did not collect additional data, as requested by reviewer #2, to increase the sample size and perform statistical tests on it. Although the acquisition of new data could theoretically be achieved, we believe this is complicated in practice, for at least two reasons:
First, the observations we report were conducted in a specific context, after having noted the distress experienced by an animal related to the separation from his partner who was participating in a neuroscience protocol. These observations were therefore not subject to a dedicated experimental design, and these sessions were dependent on the specific context in which this neuroscience protocol took place for monkey N's partner. However, since then, monkey N's partner no longer participates in neuroscience experiments, the two animals are no longer separated, they have changed housing enclosure, and some of the animal facility staff have also changed. All of this means that the context and environmental conditions in which new acquisitions would be made would be very different from those reported in the manuscript, making the relevance of these new acquisitions limited in our opinion.

We could recreate some of these initial conditions, but this would involve having to separate the two animals again, yet for relatively short periods but over several days, to keep them in small enclosures (the Allentown-type cage), which then raises ethical questions. Indeed, our intention with this manipulation was to reduce monkey N's

stress. It was only in retrospect that we thought that these observations could be of interest to other laboratories facing the same problem, recognizing, of course, the limitations of the conclusions given the small number of sessions tested.
For these various reasons, we will not be able to add new data to this study. We are nevertheless aware that the sample size is limited and we agree with the second reviewer's criticisms in this regard. To address this, we have added discussion points that call for replication in other animals and possibly more sessions, in addition to proposing alternative solutions to reduce stress in NHPs kept in captivity in neuroscience laboratories.

We hope that editors and reviewers will follow our reasoning and approach.

Below we respond to each of the reviewers' remarks. All line and/or page numbers refer to those in the revised manuscript with changes.

QUALITY OF WRITING

Reviewer 1 ticked : yes
Reviewer 1 comment :
The short note is well written. The objective are clearly stated.
It is understandable to non-specialists and could be of interest for a large audience, beyond researchers working with non-human primates.
The text and approach are easy to follow.

I would suggest to use AWB for the Animal Welfare Body in the supp. Material as it is referred to in the main manuscript.

Response: We followed the evaluator's suggestion and used Animal Welfare Body in the supplementary material section of the paper as well as in the main manuscript.

Reviewer 2 ticked : yes
Reviewer 2 comment :
This Short Note is understandable to non-specialists and well explained.
The format and instructions are respected.
The text and approach are understandable and easy to follow.

However, the dataset contains little number of sessions and the results cannot always be interpreted.

Response: We understand the reviewer's reservation regarding the limited number of sessions included in this case study. We refer her/him to the reasons why we cannot add more sessions in the opening paragraphs of this responses-to-reviewers document.

QUALITY OF FIGURES AND ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS

Reviewer 1 ticked : no
Reviewer 1 comment :
The figures are correct to support the explanations in the text, and the attached files are properly referenced in the manuscript.

Statistics are not integrated into figures, since there were no statistical tests performed. However, it would have been interesting to have the details on the non-stereotypical behaviors, and which ones are maintained in the absence of the partner ("survival"-type behaviors?).

Response: We have followed the reviewer's recommendation and we now detail in the new figure 2 the non-stereotypical behaviors in the absence of the partner of monkey N, without (figure 2B) and with (figure 2C) video enrichment.

Figure 1B could have been reproduced together with Figures 2A and 2B to show the 3 conditions (with partner/without partner without enrichment/without partner with enrichment), maybe using a different type of graph.

Response: We followed the evaluator's excellent recommendation and combined Figures 1B, 2A, and 2B into the new Figure 2A-C. However, we decided to retain the pie chart representation of the results, as this clearly visualizes the proportions of each behavioral type that constitute the animal's time budget. Furthermore, we added the corresponding percentages to improve the clarity of comparisons between conditions.

Non-stereotypical behaviors could be represented on Figure 2C and separated in more detailed categories (at least : passive vs active non-stereotypical behaviors).

Response: This is another very good suggestion that we followed. The new figure 2D now highlights the evolution of non-stereotypical behaviors during the five sessions in which the video of monkey N's partner was presented to him during her absence.

Reviewer 2 ticked : no
Reviewer 2 comment :
The figures could gain precision, here are some suggestions:
- Figures 1.B, 2.A and 2.B would gain in clarity by stating the values on it. A dot plot would be appreciated to see the sessions differences

Response: We thank the evaluator for this helpful suggestion. We now indicate the values on the figures, and to appreciate the variability between sessions, the standard deviations are also reported.

- It would be interesting to have a bar plot for 2.A and 2.B to ease the comparison between both.

Response: This is a good suggestion that we tested (please the Figure4Reviewer.png file attached to the revision), but we felt that a pie chart ultimately allowed for a better appreciation of the changes in monkey N's behavior between sessions. We hope the evaluator will agree that adding the values to the graphs nevertheless facilitates comparison between conditions.

- The non-stereotypic behaviors could also be integrated in the figures as described in the text (as different shades of green for example)

Response: We followed the reviewer's recommendation, which was also suggested by the other reviewer.

- For figure 2.C, it would be interesting to see this distribution through the sessions and versus a control

Response: The new figure 2D now highlights the evolution of the time spent by monkey N looking at the monitor as well as the evolution of his non-stereotypical behaviors during the five sessions during which the video of his partner was presented to him during her absence.

The resolution of the images is sufficient.

No statistics or std are integrated in the figures.

Response: We now indicate the mean values as well as the standard deviations on Figure 2A-C.

The legends are clear.

QUALITY OF THE EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

_____

Reviewer 1 ticked : no
Reviewer 1 comment :
Given the context in which this study has been designed, a qualitative analysis has been done. It would have been useful to have more information on the current status of the pair, to know if more data can be collected at this time to complete the data set and allow for statistical analysis. In any case, the study has been well conducted with data collected with partner/with and without video enrichment. More days of data acquisition could have strengthened the results.

Response: We thank the reviewer for this positive feedback. We are pleased to read that she/he considers this particular case study, which is indeed more qualitative than quantitative, to be well conducted.
Regarding collecting more data, as mentioned in the first paragraph of this responses-to-reviewers document, we don’t believe this is easily feasible, nor desirable. This is because monkey N's partner no longer participates in neuroscience

experiments, the two animals are no longer separated, they have changed housing enclosure, and some of the animal facility staff have also changed. Thus, the context and environmental conditions in which new acquisitions would be made would be very different from those reported in the manuscript. Moreover, collecting additional data would involve having to separate the two animals again over several days and keep them in small enclosures (the Allentown-type cage), which seems to contradict the ethical reason we undertook this work in the first place.
To address this important point however, we have modified the paper's conclusion, calling for dedicated experimentation to confirm and generalize these results (lines 194-198, page 5).

The authors have mentioned the role of the monkey's personality in the lack of success on the long term of the video enrichment. Are there some other enrichments that could be tested on this monkey (or at least, could be discussed in the short note) like : video enrichment displayed when the monkey has access to the whole housing space (even though the video monitor cannot be moved around, it could reduce the stress)/videos displaying other monkeys or different video of the partner, engaged in various types of behaviors/positive vocalisations' display/active viewing allowing for the monkey to choose to watch the video or not/videos displaying other animals or humans? Another control could have been to test video enrichment in the presence of the partner.

Response: We thank the reviewer for these suggestions. To us, another possible enrichment method to test in the future would be to offer something more interactive to the monkey, such as simple tasks on Mobile Lab (Morel Latour et al., 2025), or puzzles, so that he can interact with them and not just be a passive observer. We have included this interesting point in the discussion section of the paper (lines 186-190, page 5).

Reviewer 2 ticked : no
Reviewer 2 comment :
There are no statistical analyses due to the limited number of session (as stated line 360), thus I cannot evaluate the precision, robustness and validity of the study.

Response: As mentioned above in response to the other reviewer of this work, we acknowledge the more qualitative than quantitative nature of this case study. We cannot add more data for the reasons stated above, but to address this perfectly legitimate point, we have included elements in the paper's conclusion reiterating this fact and calling for further experimentation to confirm and generalize these results (lines 194-198, page 5).

It is also stated that monkey N "moved in the lower part of the cage (22% of the time on average), making him invisible in the videos" (line 328), resulting in a considerable loss of data and introducing a wide margin of error in the interpretability of the data.

Response: We agree with the reviewer that limiting the analysis of monkey N's behavior when he is in the upper part of the cage forces us to discard some of the data.

This choice was constrained by the camera's placement, its field of view, and the available space, which did not allow us to capture the entire cage. Furthermore, we did not want to force the monkey to remain in the upper part of the cage by using a divider for ethical reasons, as the Allentown-type cage is already a very small space compared to their daily living environment.

On presenting videos of unfamiliar macaques to monkey N, which could be received as a useful and valid control, the authors stated "No quantitative data were collected for this observation. However, it was visually noted that monkey N did not show any particular interest in the video."(lines 142-143). I would strongly recommend the authors to quantify this observation in order to compare it to the collected data in order to lay conclusion on it.

Response: Here again, we share the reviewer's opinion. Showing videos of unfamiliar macaques to monkey N represents an interesting control. Unfortunately, this session was not filmed, and therefore the quantification of the animal's behavior cannot be performed. In the conclusion section, we mention the need to collect more data in the future in a dedicated protocol to confirm and generalize the results of this case study, including by showing videos of unfamiliar macaques (lines 194-198, page 5).

Another point that is unclear to me is that the monkey N seems to be less stressed in its home enclosure than in the Allentown cage in which the experimental observations are done - why are these documentations not done in its home enclosure? While expected, this observation is again not quantified enough in the study to be used for discussion "Moreover, we observed that monkey N spent less time performing stereotypic behaviors when alone in his home enclosure compared to the reduced space (Supplementary material, section #2). Although this observation is based on a single experimental session [...]" (lines 161-163).

Response: When monkey G was to participate in the experimental neuroscience sessions, both she and her partner (monkey N) were moved to the smaller Allentown enclosure, where she could be taken out in a chair to reach the experimental room. This was done to minimize stress for both animals until the last moment. Monkey N was then kept in the Allentown. This was because when he was returned to his regular, large enclosure, he was closer to the experimental room and would "call" to his partner and distracting her (which explains the small number of sessions conducted alone in the enclosure: n = 2, one without video and one with). Furthermore, during the period when monkey N was in the Allentown, our animal technician was cleaning the regular enclosure. So, while it would have been better to keep him in his regular enclosure during periods of solitude to reduce his stress, priority was given to collecting high-quality data in monkey G and completing the required animal care tasks. This is why, in an attempt to compensate for this stress, we undertook the tests presented in this article.

On the overall, I would recommend to the authors:
- to collect more data in the presence and absence of the partner monkey to add

sessions and increase the N of sessions. This would allow the authors to do statistical tests.
- to have a wider field of view of the monkey N when filming his behavior in the cage as he is viewing the videos to be able to quantify his behavior throughout the whole session.

Response: We thank the reviewer for her/his suggestions and we agree with her/him that collecting and analyzing more data would be valuable to confirm and generalize the results of this case study. However, as mention above, we don't believe this is feasible nor desirable in the present context. Monkey N's partner (monkey G) no longer participates in neuroscience experiments, the two animals are no longer separated, they have changed housing enclosure, and some of the animal facility staff have also changed. The context and environmental conditions in which new acquisitions would be made would thus be very different from those reported in the manuscript. Moreover, collecting additional data would involve having to separate the two animals again over several days and keep them in small enclosures (the Allentown-type cage), which then raises ethical questions.
We have included elements in the paper's conclusion reiterating this fact and calling for further experimentation to confirm and generalize these results (lines 194-198, page 5).

QUALITY OF THE REPORTING

Reviewer 1 ticked : yes
Reviewer 1 comment :
Materials and methods section is sufficiently detailed to allow experiments to be repeated.
The raw data are not showed, but authors explained the methods used to get and analyze the data.

Reviewer 2 ticked : yes
Reviewer 2 comment :
The experiments details are very well explained and clear to be replicated.
The data treatment is well detailed.

There is no mention of code/data sharing, highly recommended in the guidelines.

Response: The reviewer is correct and we now mention that our data is available upon request (lines 246-248, page 8).

FINAL REVIEWERS DECISIONS

Reviewer 1 final decision : to be discussed
Reviewer 1 final comment :
I would like to acknowledge the thought process carried out by the authors and the AWB of the lab for the implementation of the refinement element described in this document to help alleviate the stress triggered by the separation from a partner during

work sessions. This is a frequent situation in non-human primates'lab and it is of great interest to communicate on what is developed to help find solutions, even though, like in this case, it was not successful.
I would suggest to add some information on the current context, as well as suggestions to implement other solutions to improve the animal well-being/welfare. If possible, it would be great to include more data from the whole homecage (using a second videocam) to increase the number of observations, as well as some control (see previous section).

Reviewer 2 final decision : to be discussed
Reviewer 2 final comment :
This short note reports a case study of refinement to improve the welfare of a paired macaque who shows signs of stereotypical behavior in the absence of his partner, gone for about an hour for experimental purposes. The work documented here has been done in margin of other protocols and proposes to show videos of the absent macaque to the one remaining alone in the home cage. While the macaque viewing the videos shows interest at first, decreasing the stereotypical behavior, the authors report a non-lasting effect.
However, to my point point of view, this dataset remains uncomplete. The matter of refinement and stress reduction is of higher matter in animal research, and the authors proposed an interesting idea; I thereby strongly recommend the authors of this case study to add more data and conduct statistical analyses to enhance its robustness.

Revised version of the Short Note submitted on: Saturday November 08, 2025

Final editorial response: Tuesday December 02, 2025

Dear Authors,

We would like to thank you for submitting the revised version of your Short Note. The second-round evaluations have now been received, and we are pleased to inform you that your manuscript has been accepted for integration into the Short Notes collection.

The reviewers did not request further modifications and expressed positive feedback on the clarity and completeness of your revisions. They noted that the additional explanations and contextual elements improved the transparency, readability, and overall interpretability of the Short Note.

Before the manuscript is deposited on HAL and assigned a DOI, we will proceed with a final editorial formatting step, which includes:

- removal of line numbering (you),

- correction of remaining typographical inconsistencies where needed (me & you),

- preparation of the official Short Notes cover page and logos (me),

- verification and formatting of supplementary files (me).

These adjustments are purely editorial in nature and do not involve any further scientific modifications; they will be completed through a brief exchange of emails to finalise the formatted version.

Once these steps are completed, the Short Note will be deposited on HAL and made available with its DOI. You will be notified as soon as the final version is online and citable.

We thank you again for your contribution and for your cooperation throughout the review process.

Sincerely,
Marc Le Bert
The Short Notes Editorial Team

PS: Please find below the second-round reviewer comments.

QUALITY OF WRITING

Reviewer 1 ticked : yes
Reviewer 2 ticked : yes
Reviewer 2 comment :
Thank you for taking my comment into account and for adding a call for replication in the discussion and conclusion. The additional explanations help clarify the context and the constraints of your study. I fully understand the ethical and practical considerations that prevent you from collecting additional sessions, and I appreciate your transparency regarding these limitations.

The points you have now included about the need for replication and about alternative approaches for reducing stress in NHPs strengthen the manuscript and make its message clearer for readers. I find your reasoning sound, and I acknowledge the value of reporting such observations despite the limited sample size.

QUALITY OF FIGURES AND ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS

Reviewer 1 ticked : yes
Reviewer 2 ticked : yes
Reviewer 2 comment :
Thank you for addressing my comments regarding the figures and for implementing many of the suggested improvements. The additions you have made greatly enhance the clarity and readability of the figures.

I appreciate that you tested the suggested bar plot for Figures 2A and 2B. Although you ultimately decided that the pie charts conveyed the behavioral changes more effectively, adding the numerical values indeed helps facilitate comparisons across conditions, and I understand your rationale.

The new Figure 2D is a valuable addition, as it provides a clearer overview of how the behavior evolved across sessions. This helps put the results into perspective and strengthens the interpretation presented in the manuscript.

Overall, I am satisfied with the revisions made to the figures and with the efforts to improve their interpretability. Thank you again for your careful consideration of these suggestions.

QUALITY OF THE EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

Reviewer 1 ticked : yes
Reviewer 2 ticked : yes
Reviewer 2 comment :
I acknowledge the added explanations you provide regarding the qualitative nature of the study and the ethical and logistical constraints preventing additional data collection. The clarifications added to the conclusion appropriately acknowledge the limitations to conduct statistical analyses and highlight the need for future, dedicated protocols.

Your comments on the restricted field of view, the absence of filmed data for the unfamiliar-macaque condition, and the reasons for conducting observations in the Allentown enclosure help contextualize these methodological constraints. I understand the balance you had to maintain between data quality and animal welfare, and I appreciate your transparency on these points.

While additional sessions and more complete recordings would indeed have strengthened the study, I recognize that these changes are not feasible under the current circumstances. I refer to the discussion and conclusion that call for replicability.

QUALITY OF THE REPORTING

Reviewer 1 ticked : yes
Reviewer 2 ticked : yes

Reviewer 2 comment :
Thank you for adding the mention about datasets availability.

FINAL REVIEWERS DECISIONS

_____

Reviewer 1 final decision : yes
Reviewer 1 final comment :
The authors have taken into account the comments, and answered accordingly.
I would like to insist on the importance of communicating on such actions to refine experiments on non-human primates. It is important to acknowledge the process and the work of the authors together with the AWB.

Reviewer 2 final decision : yes
Reviewer 2 final comment :
I would like to commend the authors for the care throughout their revisions of this Short Note about a refinement method. The efforts made to clarify the methodological constraints, to transparently discuss the limitations, and to integrate additional contextual and ethical considerations significantly strengthen the manuscript. It is encouraging to see how thoughtfully the team, together with the facility's welfare staff, approached the challenge of reducing stress associated with temporary separation.

Documenting such refinement attempts is valuable for the broader community, as it contributes to collective knowledge and may guide future improvements in similar situations. I am satisfied with the revisions and the explanations provided that has indeed improved the clarity and quality of the manuscript.

Final validation and publication: Tuesday December 02, 2025