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

Hasan Abaylı[1]

1 Firat (Euphrates) University

This manuscript reports the circulation of CPV-2a and CPV-2c in Mexican cats. Although the primary purpose of the study is understood, the research data are presented in a very short form. Some parts are not clearly stated, and few references are used. According to my suggestions, the manuscript should be reorganized according to the following questions, and the deficiencies in the manuscript should be eliminated.

1-Which settlements do the randomly sampled veterinary hospitals cover? If samples are taken from limited areas of Mexico, the title should be changed accordingly (in cat populations in eastern Mexico, etc.). If it includes all of Mexico, it would be better to increase the number of clinical samples.

Are the ParvoInt2FB and ParvoInt2CR primers used in 2-CPV-2 PCR screening specific for canine parvoviruses? If so, why not choose a protoparvovirus primer that can also detect feline parvoviruses? If these primers can also detect feline parvoviruses, have no FPLVs been detected in clinical samples? Results should be shared.

3- Reference should be added for primers ParvoInt2FB and ParvoInt2CR.

4-The results should be re-discussed with more references. Many similar studies are available in the literature.

5-Since this virus is also detected in healthy cats, is it necessary to take any precautions? What do the authors think about these measures, for example, should canine parvovirus antigens be included in cat vaccines?

6-The first paragraph of the discussion section. It was mentioned that clinicians should distinguish between a cat and canine parvovirus in infected cats. Why should clinicians feel the need to differentiate between CPV-2 and FPLV, aren't their treatments similar?

7- Abbreviations used in Table 1 should be indicated in a longer form below the table.