Reviewing process: Short Note sn20251202-5r

Impact of social and personalized visual enrichment on stereotypic behaviors in rhesus macaque monkeys in the laboratory: a case study

Peer-review Report
Short Notes applies an anonymous, free-of-charge peer-review process conducted by experts in the relevant field. After acceptance, reviewers' reports, authors' responses and revisions, and the editorial decision are published, and reviewers may choose to disclose their identity.

Peer-reviewers:

- Reviewer 1 : Sabrina RAVEL, CS FC3R
- Reviewer 2 : Maëva GACOIN, McGill University - Canada

Executive Editor: Marc Le Bert, FC3R

Course of the Short Note sn20251202-5r

Short Note submitted on: July 30, 2025

Editorial response: September 27, 2025

Author's response: November 08, 2025

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

Final editorial response: 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: December 02, 2025