

Review of: "A Comparison of Performance for Different SARS-Cov-2 Sequencing Protocols"

Roald Tiggelaar¹

¹ University of Twente

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The topic of the contribution is certainly interesting. Although this work is more a (descriptive) comparison between the performances of sequencing protocol, rather than a (scientific) journal article, it certainly has added value that justifies its publication. The analysis as done by the author is meaningful and relevant, for example the differences between reference-based assembly and references. As such, the contribution induces awareness on the performances of SARS-Cov-2 sequencing protocol and emphasizes/highlights shortcomings that should be solved.

In fact, the style of the contribution – e.g. use of ‘we’ (in abstract) and later on ‘I’ – could be of a more neutral intonation, whereas an improved Introduction (why are aspects from references (1)-(3) quoted and not ‘integrated’ within the text?) will raise the level from ‘draft’ to ‘paper’. On the other hand, use of ‘first person (singular or plural)’ properly expresses the concerns/worries of the author regarding the performance of current sequencing protocols.