Qeios

Peer Review

Review of: "Critique of "First quantitative assessment of the effects of parasite control in dogs and cats in the UK": Re-examining Parasiticide-Industry-Funded Estimates of Parasite-Control Benefits in UK Dogs and Cats"

W. Jean Dodds[1]

1. Hemopet, Garden Grove, United States

This critique of Giannelli et al. (Parasites & Vectors 18:498, 2025 https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s13071-025-07137-8) is important and correct, in my opinion.

As restated here, the CONCLUSIONS are correct and well documented in the References. "Given the widespread use of parasiticides in UK companion animals, their substantial financial implications for households, and growing evidence of large-scale environmental and potential human health risks [21][22][23][24][25], accurate and transparent modelling with balanced consideration of both benefits and risks - consistent with One-Health principles - is essential to support informed decision-making regarding their use. Taken together, the issues identified above - non-representative parasite prevalence estimates, clinical-disease prevalence values that do not correspond to their cited sources, opaque model inputs, unsupported assumptions, omission of preventive-treatment costs, and reliance on guidelines whose scientific rigour has not been demonstrated – indicate that the model's output is not scientifically valid. We note that the clinical-disease prevalence values used in the model, which do not correspond to the quantities reported in their cited sources, constitute major errors that compromise the reliability of the findings, meeting the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) criteria for retraction [26]."

Declarations

doi.org/10.32388/3KNFZJ

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.