

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_123617
Title of the Manuscript:	“Porcine Circovirus Infections: Current Knowledge and Future Perspectives in Disease Control”
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>

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.	The manuscript addresses an important issue concerning the welfare of porcines. However, it has several limitations. First, it is overly brief and does not adequately expand on key subtopics. Second, it lacks citations from the most recent research, relying primarily on outdated sources despite the availability of more current information. This results in an incomplete overview, as the manuscript fails to incorporate the latest advancements and knowledge in the field. Overall, it reads more like a very basic summary rather than a comprehensive and detailed analysis.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is a bit misleading. The title “Porcine Circovirus Infections: Current Knowledge and Future Perspectives in Disease Control” suggests that the manuscript should cover all porcine circoviruses, but it mainly focuses on Porcine Circovirus type 2 (PCV2). Porcine Circovirus types 1 (PCV1), 3 (PCV3), and 4 (PCV4) are only mentioned briefly in a few places of manuscript. Therefore, the title should be narrowed down, for example: “Porcine Circovirus Type 2 Infections: Current Knowledge and Future Perspectives in Disease Control,” or, alternatively, the other porcine circoviruses should be described in detail, as is done for PCV2.	

Review Form 3

<p>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>	<p>Although the abstract is structurally well-written, it promotes aspects that are not reflected in the general manuscript.</p> <p>For example: "This review provides a comprehensive analysis of the current knowledge on porcine circoviruses, focusing on two main species, PCV2 and PCV3..." – the manuscript focuses mainly only on PCV2.; "... the review delves into the host immune responses to PCV infection, including the role of both humoral and cell-mediated immunity."- the mechanisms of viral pathogenesis and the roles of humoral and cell-mediated immunity could be explained more appropriately, logically, and thoroughly.; "The effectiveness of current vaccines against PCV2 and the challenges posed by PCV3, which has no available vaccine, are critically examined." - unfulfilled statement.; "Finally, the review highlights future research directions, including the need for novel vaccines, improved diagnostic tools, and a deeper understanding of PCV3 pathogenesis." - PCV3 pathogenesis is not even discussed in the manuscript.</p> <p>It is suggested to either reduce the emphasis in the abstract or to expand the manuscript to cover what is promised to the reader.</p> <p>The abstract is completely inconsistent with the conclusions presented, leaving unclear what the authors intended to emphasize in their article.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The article is structurally well-prepared. The subsections are logically arranged and cover the topic of the article.</p>	
<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 provides scientifically accurate information. However, there are subsections in the manuscript where more detailed information would be desired, e.g., 2.2 Factors Influencing PCV2-Related Diseases. This section contains insufficient information also there is lack of the most recent research. As we see, the complications of PCV2 pathogenesis are mainly dependent on these interactions (viral, host autoimmunity, co-infection and ect.), thus, more detailed information about these disease-modulating factors seems essential.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Although some subsections are described in detail and properly cited, there is a lack of the most recent literature, both in terms of citations and up-to-date information.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English language quality is good.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Here are some questions for the authors that, if addressed in the manuscript, could improve its quality and scientific value:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Can you expand on the environmental conditions that may influence the stability and inactivation of the virus? Providing details such as temperature, pH range, or other factors would enhance the understanding of viral control measures. 2) What are the most recent findings on the virus's pathogenesis? Including up-to-date research and citations would strengthen the manuscript's relevance and scientific grounding. 3) Could the pathogenesis of the viruses you describe be influenced by chronic autoimmune diseases in pigs, which may develop due to factors such as improper feed? 4) What challenges does PCV3 present, and why hasn't a vaccine been developed against this virus? Recommendation for the authors to discuss in the manuscript the limited understanding of the virus, diverse symptoms, genetic variability, and overlap with other diseases. 	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>Author's comment (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)</p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Ieva Simoliune</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Vilnius University, Lithuania</p>