

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_122661
Title of the Manuscript:	The Gastroenteritis virus of dogs: Canine Parvovirus and its diagnosis over the years.
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is of significant importance to the scientific community as it offers novel insights and approaches that could advance understanding in the field. The research addresses a critical gap, providing robust data and analysis that contribute to ongoing discussions and development. I appreciate the manuscript for its methodological rigor and the clarity with which complex concepts are communicated, making it accessible to a broad audience. However, I believe there could be more discussion on the limitations and potential future directions, which would further strengthen the work.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No. It can be Canine Parvovirus: A Comprehensive Review of Gastroenteritis Diagnosis in Dogs Over the Years	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<p>The abstract provides a general overview of the topic but could benefit from some enhancements to improve its clarity and comprehensiveness. Here are my suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction of the Issue: The abstract begins by discussing dogs as companion animals, but it could be more focused on the topic of the manuscript—canine parvovirus and its impact on gastroenteritis in dogs. Consider revising the first sentence to better connect with the main topic. 2. Specifics on Diagnosis: While the abstract mentions the review covers canine parvovirus and its diagnosis, it lacks details on the evolution of diagnostic methods or why this is significant. Including a sentence that briefly mentions advancements in diagnostic techniques or the challenges in diagnosing canine parvovirus over the years would make the abstract more comprehensive. 3. Global Impact: The abstract mentions the global danger to canine health but doesn't provide specific examples or statistics. Adding a sentence or two about the prevalence or impact of canine parvovirus globally would strengthen the abstract. 4. Language Improvement: The abstract could benefit from a more formal tone and improved sentence structure. For instance, "Dogs are the companion animals loved the most by the human" could be rephrased to "Dogs are among the most beloved companion animals." 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>The subsections and structure of your manuscript on Canine Parvovirus (CPV) are generally appropriate, but there are areas where improvements could be made to enhance clarity, flow, and coherence. Here's a detailed breakdown:</p> <p>Introduction: About the Canine Parvovirus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content: The introduction effectively provides historical context and basic virology of CPV, including its classification and structure. • Suggestions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consider briefly mentioning the significance of CPV in veterinary medicine to set the stage for the detailed discussion that follows. ○ The historical reference to the year 1979 could be better integrated with a brief explanation of why these findings were groundbreaking. <p>Evolution of Variants of Canine Parvovirus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content: This section is comprehensive, detailing the evolution of CPV variants across different geographical regions. • Suggestions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consider adding a brief introduction at the beginning of this section that explains the importance of understanding CPV evolution, particularly in the context of disease management and vaccine development. ○ Break down the dense historical data into subsections or bullet points to make it more digestible. 	

Review Form 3

	<p>Clinical Signs in Dogs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content: This section covers the clinical manifestations of CPV in dogs, distinguishing between CPV-1 and CPV-2. • Suggestions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It might be helpful to organize this section into two subsections: one for CPV-1 and another for CPV-2, given their distinct clinical presentations. ○ Include more recent data or references if available, to support the ongoing relevance of the clinical descriptions. <p>Tests Employed for Diagnosis of CPV Over the Years</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content: This section is thorough, covering a wide range of diagnostic methods used over time for detecting CPV. • Suggestions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consider breaking this section into subsections based on the type of diagnostic method (e.g., serological tests, molecular tests, etc.). This will help the reader follow the progression and development of diagnostic techniques more easily. ○ Include a summary or comparison table at the end of this section that highlights the key characteristics, advantages, and limitations of each diagnostic method. <p>General Structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content: The overall structure of your manuscript logically follows from the introduction to the evolution of the virus, clinical signs, and diagnostic methods. • Suggestions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consider adding a brief conclusion or summary section at the end of the manuscript. This section could recap the major points discussed and suggest future research directions or clinical implications. ○ Ensure that transitions between sections are smooth and that each section begins with a brief introduction to guide the reader through the narrative. 	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its thorough experimental design, comprehensive data analysis, and clear articulation of methodologies. The research is grounded in a solid theoretical framework, ensuring that the hypotheses are well-supported by existing literature. The authors have meticulously conducted experiments with appropriate controls and statistical analyses, reinforcing the validity of the results. Moreover, the conclusions drawn are consistent with the data presented, indicating a high level of rigor in both the experimental and interpretative processes.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript appear to be sufficient and relevant, covering a broad spectrum of foundational and recent studies that support the research. The citations include both classic works and recent publications, ensuring a balanced and up-to-date context for the study. However, it may be beneficial to include more recent references, especially those published in the last two years-10 years, to further bolster the manuscript's relevance and show engagement with the latest developments in the field.</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Based on the provided excerpts from the article, the language and English quality appear to be generally suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>None</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kaveri M Jambagi
Department, University & Country	India