

Review of: "Characterization and complete genome sequence of bacteriophage vB_Vc_SrVc2, a marine phage that infects *Vibrio campbellii*"

Abbas Soleimani-Delfan

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

This manuscript reported a *Autographiviridae* bacteriophage named vB_Vc_SrVc2 which infected *Vibrio campbellii*. The lytic effect and characteristics of this phage were studied. Also, the genome of this phage has been analyzed. The vB_Vc_SrVc2 can tolerate harsh environmental conditions. Thus, the authors of this manuscript think vB_Vc_SrVc2 is a potential phage for the treatment of *Vibrio campbellii* infection in shrimp or for controlling *Vibrio campbellii* in the aquaculture. Some issues should be addressed:

1. *Abstract:* Authors said, "....with high lytic ability against *Vibrio* isolates". Which species sensitive against the isolated phage??
2. *Abstract:* please check punctuation in this section and all the text.
3. *Abstract:* Authors said, "Overall phage vB_Vc_SrVc2 has a good potential for therapeutic...." Only when the animal experiment is done, this conclusion can be draw.
4. Under the materials and methods section, under "Bacterial strains" the authors use the "killing curves" term. It is not smooth for the bacterial reduction test.
5. 2.1×10^8 or 4.6×10^9 . It should be unified in the manuscript, including the figures and legends.
6. Bacteriophages isolation and propagation section: Authors said: " vB_Vc_SrVc2 was performed as previously described in [14] or "using the standardized procedure described by [15]" or "using serial dilutions to obtain individual phage plaques according to [15]" is better to revise and the name of cited authors add before citations and bibliographies. It is be unified in the manuscript.
7. In the Bacteriophages isolation and propagation section: what is the meaning of "Using a positive lytic zone" please clarify the meaning of "positive lytic zone".
8. 25°C or 25 °C, It should be unified in the manuscript, including the figures and legends.
9. In the phage host range section: It is better to use different bacterial species for the evaluation of the phage host range.
10. In the phage DNA purification and sequencing section: the sentence " Total DNA was then isolated using, 500 µL of lysis buffer (NaCl 100 mM, Tris 50 mM, EDTA 100 mM, SDS 1%,) was added and vigorously vortexed for 10 s" should be revised.
11. Please use standard nomenclature convention for bacterial species and other microorganisms (*italic*, etc.).
12. The manuscript contains some typos, please check and correct them.

13. In the first paragraph in the discussion section the authors said: "Here, We isolated a new lytic phage vB_Vc_SrVc2 against *Vibrio parahaemolyticus* AHPND" please change the bacterial host species to *Vibrio campbellii*.

14. The authors imply: "Genome analysis showed 50 putative ORFs" but in the submitted version at NCBI only 49 ORFs were observed. On the other hand, the authors said: "a total of 26 proteins (46%) were annotated as hypothetical and the remaining 34 proteins (54%) were assigned a function. (26+34=60???)". It seems some correction is necessary for this section.

Overall, the manuscript is interesting for researchers, especially phage enthusiastic.