Review of: "RNA in-situ hybridization for pathology-based diagnosis of feline infectious peritonitis (FIP): current diagnostics for FIP and comparison to the current gold standard"

Wei Liu[1]

1 Uppsala University

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

The study investigated the differences between FIPV RNA ISH probe and FIP immunohistochemistry antibody for the diagnosis of FIP in cats. They performed the comparison using adjacent sections. The results are convincing that ISH gave more robust signals. The manuscript is nicely written.

When authors use the word gene, for example in “FIPV ORF1ab gene”, is the ISH detecting mRNA rather than DNA?

IHC detection of FIPV nucleocapsid shows diffuse pattern while other IHC staining looks similar to the dots pattern in detection of FIPV ORF1ab RNA by using ISH. According to ourselves’ work and literatures, the ISH staining mostly appears dots (transcripts) or patches (cluster of dots); immunohistochemistry shows mostly diffuse, homogenous staining. Can authors explain the pattern in the present report, according to such as the virus epitope distribution?
Negative ISH may show a few unspecific dots in the section, while negative IHC could show certain unspecific staining. What do authors experience in their negative control sections, no signal at all or what?
In page 3, under Serum biochemistry, “.....Attempts at interpreting acute phase protein levels in the diagnosis of FIP have are associated…” should be “.....Attempts at interpreting acute phase protein levels in the diagnosis of FIP have been associated…”?