From: editorial@elifesciences.org
Subject: eLife review invitation (from Albert Cardona)
Date: 25 June 2025 at 17:10
To: alexander.shakeel.bates@gmail.com
Cc: Alexander_Bates@hms.harvard.edu

Dear Alex,

Hope all is well. This manuscript made me think of your work, and I'd very much appreciate if you were to give it a deep read and send back a review.

All the best,

Albert Cardona

Dear Alexander,

I'm writing in the hope that you'll be willing to review this article, "Bilateral equalization of synaptic output in olfactory glomeruli of Xenopus tadpoles", for eLife (eLife-RP-RA-2025-107710).

We ask for comments to be returned within 14 days. I'll look forward to hearing from you.

Best wishes,

Albert Cardona
Reviewing Editor
eLife

xxxxxxxxxx

eLife is committed to improving peer review to better convey the assessments made by editors and reviewers. We have therefore changed our editorial process to emphasize public reviews and assessments of preprints by eliminating accept/reject decisions after peer review. The new process results in a Reviewed Preprint, accompanied by an eLife assessment and the public reviews, published on eLife's website.

* With your help, this approach brings together the immediacy and openness of a preprint with the scrutiny of peer review by experts. *

Read more: https://elifesciences.org/inside-elife/54d63486/elife-s-new-model-changing-the-way-you-share-your-research

To respond, please use the link below and select either "Agree to Review" or "Decline to Review" from the TASKS tab:

[https://elife-rp.msubmit.net/cgi-bin/main.plex?el=A3RF6BBfH3A1BeJj2F4A9ftdSDGkdwbnfXRPJFbkpDSPHgZ]

xxxxxxxxxx

We ask you to structure your review into three parts: (1) a short statement on the significance of the findings and the strength of evidence, (2) the public review with guidance for readers around how to interpret the work, highlighting important findings but also mentioning caveats where they exist, and (3) specific feedback to the authors.

Your name will not appear on the public review. All public reviews are signed by eLife, putting the onus on us as an organization and community to ensure that our reviews are of the highest quality and ethics.

We continue our policy of consultation between the reviewers. If you agree to review this paper, once all the reviews have been received, you will be invited to discuss your comments with the other reviewers in an online consultation session, in which the reviewers will be identified to one another, and you can provide input.

Please note: we recommend that public reviews include the following subheadings: Summary, Strengths, Weaknesses. The authors will be able to revise their work (ideally once), in which case we would ask you to update your public review, so it's specific to the new version of the work. Structuring your public review with subheadings will make it easier to update the original public review.

The abstract and information about the review process are below, and you can read what we have published so far at https://elifesciences.org.

xxxxxxxxxx

If you have competing interests that preclude an objective review, or you cannot otherwise provide a review of the work in the timeframe, please DECLINE using the link below. Suggestions for alternatives are very welcome. (Where it's appropriate to do so, it would be helpful if you could offer a brief opinion about the work, even if you're declining to review.)

By taking on this assignment, you agree to conduct your review according to the terms in the eLife Reviewer Guide - https://elife-rp.msubmit.net/cgi-bin/main.plex?form_type=display_rev_instructions#process - and you agree to our confidentiality notices below*, which help us to protect the personal data of authors, editors, and reviewers.

xxxxxxxxxx

Title: Bilateral equalization of synaptic output in olfactory glomeruli of Xenopus tadpoles

Authors: Marta Casas, Beatrice Terni, and Artur Llobet

Abstract:
Odorants stimulate olfactory sensory neurons (OSNs) to create a bilateral sensory map defined by a set of glomeruli present in the left and right olfactory bulbs. Using *Xenopus tropicalis* tadpoles we challenged the notion that glomerular activation is exclusively determined ipsilaterally. Glomerular responses evoked by unilateral stimulation were potentiated following transection of the contralateral olfactory nerve. The gain of function was observed as early as 2 hours after injury and faded away with a time constant of 4 days. Potentiation was mediated by the presence of larger and faster calcium transients driving glutamate release from OSN axon terminals. The cause was the reduction of the tonic presynaptic inhibition exerted by dopamine D_2 receptors. Inflammatory mediators generated by injury were not involved. These findings reveal the presence of a bilateral modulation of glomerular output driven by dopamine that compensates for imbalances in the number

presence of a bilateral modulation of glomerular output driven by dopamine that compensates for imbalances in the number of operative OSNs present in the two olfactory epithelia. Considering that the constant turnover of OSNs is an evolutionary conserved feature of the olfactory system and determines the innervation of glomeruli, the compensatory mechanism here described may represent a general property of the vertebrate olfactory system to establish an odor map.

xxxxxxxxxx

Information about Competing Interests:

Editors, reviewers, and potential reviewers are required to fully declare all potential competing interests that could lead them to be positively or negatively disposed towards an article before they agree to edit or review it. Reviewers must recuse themselves if they feel that they are unable to offer an impartial review. Common reasons for editors and reviewers to recuse themselves from the peer-review process include but are not limited to: Working at the same institution or organization as one or more of the authors, currently or recently; Having collaborated with, or served as a mentor to, one or more of the authors during the past 5 years; Having held grants with one or more of the authors, currently or recently; Having a personal relationship with an author that does not allow you to evaluate the manuscript objectively.

xxxxxxxxxx

* Confidentiality and Personal Data:

We do not release the identities of the reviewers to the authors but in the course of the discussion that forms part of the review process, each reviewer will know the identity of the other reviewer(s).

The review process is strictly confidential and must be treated as such by reviewers during the review process and subsequently:

1. If you agree to provide a review, we will send you the following data: author, editor and reviewer contact information, copies of submitted manuscripts and review comments and discussions arising from the review of those manuscripts, which you will handle only for the duration of the peer-review process.

2. You will only act on our written instructions when handling this personal data, you will keep the personal data secure, and not use the personal data for any other purpose than a review for eLife.

3. You will not ask anyone else to carry out this peer review for you, without our prior agreement.

4. You will assist us in allowing data subjects to exercise their rights under data protection laws, if you hold personal data relevant to them. You will also assist us in meeting our data protection obligations in relation to audits, security, notification of data breaches, and data protection impact assessments.

5. You will delete or return (at our choice) the personal data you hold on our behalf once the decision has been completed.

6. You will report any relevant personal data breaches to us immediately, as well as whether you believe our instructions in connection with the personal data infringes applicable laws.

xxxxxxxxxx