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

Ivo Sirakov

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

The idea is good, the methods are acceptable but not complete. The study has potential if the data is presented in a different form. The manuscript can also be revised as a "letter to the editor" or "brief communication" subject to the relevant remarks.

Introduction: Because the difference in some characteristics between FPV and CPV was commented above, it is good to comment, the same, in case of co-infection of the two viruses.

MM: It is good to indicate the city or cities where the samples were obtained.

Have primers checked in nucleotide BLAST, NCBI for similarity to other viruses and the BLAST results have to be discussed.

Note, how the annealing temperature of the primers was determined?

Note the ethidium bromide concentration.

Note the used DNA Ladder.

Describe the performed gel electrophoresis.

Indicate the number of the sequenced samples. MEGA11 and ClustalW need citation.

Results: Table 1 should be presented as a graph with the number/percentage of the presented CPV types.

Why are the obtained sequences compared to FPV and not a phylogenetic analysis (nucleic acid and protein) against other NCBI isolates were performed? FPV can be used as an external branch - root of the tree. If the aim is a differential diagnosis with FPV, as mentioned in the “Discussion” section, then this can be established as early as primer synthesis.

The discussion should be supplemented with data based on phylogenetic analysis and established mutations (synonymous and non-synonymous) epidemiology, correlation between mutations and clinical symptoms.