

Review of: "Identification of Canine Parvovirus Antigenic Types Circulating in the Mexican Cat Population"

Maria Luisa Marenzoni¹

¹ University of Perugia

Potential competing interests: The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

The article is quite well structured and very clear to read.

However, there are many points that need clarification and that can be improved.

In general, the material and methods section must be improved by describing the population from which the samples were taken, the time period in which they were carried out, the location (that is partially described in the discussion, which is non clear for a reader; how many hospitals? In which part of Mexico?).

The references are dated and not exhaustive. I.e. references of Clegg et al., 2012 or Rehme et al., 2022 should be included, also to integrate discussions.

Discussions are scarce and inappropriate; a comparison with references having data of populations with different characteristics and at different prevalence should be made.

Apart from the results for CPV, it would also be useful to understand how many positives there are for FPV, which in any case is a relevant aspect for the epidemiology of the infection.

Some detailed points:

- In the abstract, a 60% positivity is cited in cats with gastroenteritis, while in the results it is 16%;
- capital letters in "additionally", "all sequences...";
- space between ; and plus 28.5...;
- lowercase in Samples of DNA samples;
- some sentences of the discussion are non clear, confusing between reporting the citation or commenting the results of the current study (i.e.: "In 2001, CPV-2c was reported to be more virulent than CPV-2a and to be dispersed more efficiently amongst cat populations.": no quotation is reported for this sentence and the reader doesn't know the year of the sampling of the present study; "therefore, it is necessary to conduct laboratory tests that are highly sensitive and specific to distinguish between both viruses. In addition, canine parvovirus could be producing signs of disease in cats. However, small animal clinicians commonly do not consider this virus; therefore, infection by CPV-2 has rarely been considered a differential diagnosis to FPV. ": the identification of the virus is relevant for epidemiology and surveillance, because this

virus is characterized by high rates of mutations);

- "Interestingly, this antigenic type of CPV-2 only was identified in healthy cats, while CPV-2c is most frequent in dogs and cats.": no dogs were evaluated in the current study.