Jentashapir Journal of Cellular and Molecular Biology
Volume 12 · Issue 1 · e113460

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Molecular and Immunologic Detection of Canine Distemper Virus (CDV) and Investigation of Co-infection with *Candida albicans* in Dogs

Fatemeh Ahmadi Sheikh Shabani, Azam Mokhtari, Somayeh Shahrokh Shahraki

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
1 Feb 2021	1 Mar 2021	1 Mar 2021	10.5812/jjcmb.113460

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1, Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 7
3 **Revision 2** Editor-in-Chief 8
Authors' reply to reviewers 9
Reviewer and editor comments 10
4 **Revision 3** Editor-in-Chief 11
Authors' reply to reviewers 12
Reviewer and editor comments 13

1 Original submission

4 comments · 12 Feb 2021 – 15 Feb 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 12 Feb 2021

Dear AE<
The manuscript was about co-infection with distemper and Candida in dogs. The article needs to be rewritten to improve the writing. Other cases are mentioned in the text.
Best regards

Referee 2 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 15 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
1- The scientific name of C. albicans is normally shown in italics.
2- The critical points for selecting a sampling case should be mentioned.
Materials and methods:
3- One of the best and safest ways to isolate and identify Candida sp. in clinical specimens is direct observation and culture, especially on chrom candida agar. Why were the samples not cultured? Sample culturing and molecular detection are complementary.
In this study, there is a fundamental problem in the molecular identification of Candida albicans, and that is the use of an old reference and primers that are not cited by mycologists. Usually, the ITS1,2 area (ITS Region of rDNA) is used for identification with primers ITS1, 4 or v9g, ls266. Khan et al. performed Nested PCR with several primers for Candida species. This part and the DNA extraction of C. albicans are very ambiguous.
4- Reference 12 (Doyle et al (1990)) is missing from the manuscript. [For investigation of C. albicans, total DNA was isolated with some modifications in the protocol proposed by Doyle et al (1990) (12).]
5- How is the number of samples calculated?
6- Delete the blast and alignment images of C. albicans. They are not necessary.
Thanks.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 15 Feb 2021

Dear EIC,
This manuscript needs to be revised. Actually, a major revision is needed. Thus, I encourage the authors to correct their manuscript point by point in accordance with the comments raised by the reviewers.

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 15 Feb 2021

Dear Author,
There are major and minor points in your manuscript that must be revised. Please make all needed corrections exactly, accurately, and painstakingly to avoid extra revision.
Best
EIC, Dr. Mard

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

2/20/2021

Dear Associates Editor

Jentashapir Journal of Cellular and Molecular Biology

We thank Associate Editor and the anonymous referees for their careful reading of our manuscript. We also greatly appreciate the referees for their valuable comments and constructive suggestions for the paper revision and consideration of publication. We took into consideration the reviewers suggestions and made some changes in the manuscript.

Please consider this point-by-point response to the reviewers concerns. We hope you find our answers satisfactory and that this version of modified paper will be acceptable.

Sincerely

The authors

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

Dear editor

The manuscript was about co-infection of distemper and Candida in dogs. The article needs to be rewritten in terms of writing. Other cases are mentioned in the text.

Thank you for your Valuable comments, we corrected all cases you highlighted in the text.

Best regards

Reviewer 2:

1- The scientific name of C. albicans is normally shown in italics.

Thanks for your notification. All of the cases were corrected.

2- It should be mentioned critical points for selecting a sampling case

Thanks for your accuracy. This sentence was added in the text:

One of the limitations of the present study was the achievement of a large number of symptomatic CDV cases. For this reason, a statistically appropriate sample size was not obtained.

Materials and methods:

3- One of the best and safest ways to isolate and identify Candida sp. in clinical specimens is direct observation and culture especially on chrom candida agar. Why were the samples not cultured?Sample culturing and molecular detection are complementary.

Thank you for your advice, we had done the culture for C. albicans. However, since we focused on molecular detection, we didn't mention its results in the text. These methods and results were added in the manuscript.

Culture test, Gram Staining:

Culture test were conducted on Sabouraud's dextrose agar plate. Smears were prepared on slides cleaned with alcohol. They then heat-fixed;-stained with crystal violet solution (1 min) and consequently, Gram's iodine (1 min). After the washing, the treatment was performed with 95 % ethanol and aqueous basic fuchsin. Then, the slide was observed with a Bright Field microscope.

On Sabouraud's dextrose agar, the smooth creamy white colonies with a characteristic yeast odour were seen. In the Gram stained smears, budding yeast cells and pseudomycelium were typical (Figs. 5 and 6).

In this study, there is a fundamental problem in the molecular identification of Candida albicans, and that is the use of an old reference and primers that are not cited by mycologists. Usually,The ITS1,2 area(ITS Region of rDNA) is used for identification by primers ITS1, 4 or v9g, ls266. Khan and et al. has done Nested PCR with several primer for Candida species. This part and DNA extraction of C. albicans is very ambiguous.

Thank you very much for your detailed information and guidance. We accept this objection, but fortunately the sequencing results confirmed of the PCR results for C.albicans.

4- In the manuscript, there is not Reference 12(Doyle et al (1990). [For investigation of C. albicans, total DNA was isolated with some modifications in the protocol proposed by Doyle et al (1990) (12).]

Thanks for your accuracy. We corrected it:

…….proposed by Doyle et al (1990) (cited in Davies et al.) (12).

Davies RL, MacCorquodale R, Baillie S, Caffrey B. Characterization and comparison of Pasteurella multocida strains associated with porcine pneumonia and atrophic rhinitis. Journal of Mededical Microbiology. 2003;52(Pt 1):59–67.

5- How are the number of samples calculated?

One of the limitations of the present study was the achievement of a large number of symptomatic CDV cases. For this reason, a statistically appropriate sample size was not obtained.

6- Delete the blast and alignment images of C. albicans. They are not necessary.

Thank you for your advice. Let us we don't delete them since based on the valuable information in your comment our results will be approved with the results of sequencing: "In this study, there is a fundamental problem in the molecular identification of Candida albicans, and that is the use of an old reference and primers that are not cited by mycologists. Usually,The ITS1,2 area(ITS Region of rDNA) is used for identification by primers ITS1, 4 or v9g, ls266. Khan and et al. has done Nested PCR with several primer for Candida species. This part and DNA extraction of C. albicans is very ambiguous."

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 27 Feb 2021 – 27 Feb 2021

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 27 Feb 2021

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 27 Feb 2021

Dear Author,
It is my pleasure to inform you that your manuscript is provisionally accepted for publication in JJCMB, but directly mentioning the outputs of SPSS is not acceptable. Results must be stated/presented in Figures/Tables format. Revise your manuscript and send the revision as soon as possible.
Thanks.

3

Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

,Dear Editor

Greetings and respect

While thanking you for your efforts: regarding the results of the statistical tests, it was stated in the text of the article that Tables 1-13 should be consulted. .However, the tables were not included in the revised text

For this reason, the tables were provided in a separate file so that, if deemed appropriate, they can be included at the end of the text after final acceptance of .the article

With thanks for your efforts - The authors

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 28 Feb 2021

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 28 Feb 2021

Dear Author,
As I wrote you yesterday, you must state your results in the form of figures or tables.
Best
EIC, Dr. Mard

4

Revision 3

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

The authors did not provide a point-by-point response to the reviewers' comments in this round.

4 Revision 3

1 comment · 1 Mar 2021

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 1 Mar 2021

Dear Author,
Your revision is now accepted for publication in JJCMB. Please correct P<0.5 to P<0.05 when you receive the galley proof of your paper.
Yours Sincerely
EIC, Dr. Mard