Review of: "Seroprevalence of parvovirus infections from vaccinated and unvaccinated dogs of Andhra Pradesh"

Josef Hanekom[1]

1 University of Pretoria

Potential competing interests: The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.: None exist

Well done on the manuscript. Please do not take the following as anything other than constructive criticism with the aim to improve the chance of publication of your work.

Overall I think you need to have a clearer idea of what you want to say. And the submission needs a complete rethinking, rereading and rewriting with a more direct interesting message. The result of vaccinated dogs having better antibody than unvaccinated seems fairly obvious. I am surprised that someone found otherwise, and is more likely an indication of poor vaccination quality, cold storage or administration of vaccines. The final sentence of the abstract is not drawn from your findings

What I feel are your interesting findings are the following:

1. My feeling is that 72% of dogs that were not vaccinated had antibodies to CPV implying that they had survived infection.
2. There is a huge difference between HI and iELISA .. needs more exploration and explanation… which or you results should we trust and why
3. The antibodies in vaccinated dogs implies that your vaccinations are working well, but is worth explaining what is implied by vaccination. Might be worth expanding on this in each of the categories.
4. You have enough numbers to expand on risk factors of seropositivity of unvaccinated dogs having antibodies which may be an inverse of survival predictors
5. There is no inclusion or exclusion criteria of how these dogs were selected. Were they owned?

Couple of points:

- Was there a selection bias towards dogs that had survived infection
- Was ethical approval performed
- Think you need to define your inclusion and exclusion criteria better
- How did you define vaccination? 1 vaccination 2, 3, vaccines (maybe sub divide the this) vaccination age etc
- Also the time from the last vaccination should be looked at.
- Your selection appears skewed towards young dogs. It may be worth subdividing them more.

- Dogs tested under 2 (were they older than 3 months or could they still have maternal antibodies

- I think you need to discuss sensitivity and specificity of each test more clearly.

- Looks like a big difference between HI and ELISA and this should be explored more

- Worth doing some sort of risk analysis for age groups, sex, breed

- Did not see where you did the Chi-square.

- Introduction first sentence does not make sense missing something

- You did not report the sensitivity or specificity of HI to iELISA and not need to have a version of a gold standard or recognized test and only mention it in conclusion (should be in the results and discussed.

Good luck with the revisions and hope that this criticism has been helpful.

- Dogs tested under 2 (were they older than 3 months or could they still have maternal antibodies

- I think you need to discuss sensitivity and specificity of each test more clearly.