



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Virology

ESPS manuscript NO: 19439

Title: Pathogenicity of a currently circulating Chinese variant pseudorabies virus in pigs

Reviewer's code: 00504943

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2015-05-09 20:36

Date reviewed: 2015-05-20 13:57

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript stated the pathogenicity of a new PRV variant isolated from Bartha-K61 -vaccinated pig farms with huge economic losses. Experiment design and result were clear and convincing. Only there were some language problems that should be improved, especially on the "abstract".



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Virology

ESPS manuscript NO: 19439

Title: Pathogenicity of a currently circulating Chinese variant pseudorabies virus in pigs

Reviewer's code: 00503977

Reviewer's country: Argentina

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2015-05-09 20:36

Date reviewed: 2015-06-03 18:33

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Paper is focused on the characterization of a new isolate of pseudorabies virus in pigs. The paper written need a careful revision by an english native people. In addition, authors should critically read the paper and rewrite some paragraphs in order to clarify them.



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Virology
ESPS manuscript NO: 19439
Title: Pathogenicity of a currently circulating Chinese variant pseudorabies virus in pigs
Reviewer’s code: 00503963
Reviewer’s country: China
Science editor: Yue-Li Tian
Date sent for review: 2015-05-09 20:36
Date reviewed: 2015-06-04 14:20

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The current study compares the pathogenicity between PRV variant and classical Fa strain. My suggestions are described as below: 1. How about the critical/major antigenic difference or certain different in molecular level between new- and classical-PRV? 2. Fa strain is strong or weak virulent? 3. The immune response is different after infection of PRV new strain? 4. In my opinion, Table 2 use “-” or “+” is not enough to express the animal situation, use 2 or 3 or 4 “+” could be more clearly to distinguish the degree of symptoms. 5. Figure 1, normal pig organ pictures also need to show. 6. Figure 2A and 2B, normal pig conditions need to show. 7. Figure 3, IHC staining of normal pig also need to show.



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Virology

ESPS manuscript NO: 19439

Title: Pathogenicity of a currently circulating Chinese variant pseudorabies virus in pigs

Reviewer's code: 00504378

Reviewer's country: South Korea

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2015-05-09 20:36

Date reviewed: 2015-06-02 17:13

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript report analysis of the pathogenicity of a new PRV variant that cannot be protected by a commonly used vaccine and causes massive economic losses in China, and comparison of the pathogenicity of this variant and classical PRV Fa stain. Considering the importance of the disease, the manuscript is worth of publication although the comparison is very limited. The authors showed the results that they wanted to show and provided proper discussions. However, the description of the results and discussion is not clear enough as some are mentioned as below. The comments in the attached file are some examples and the entire manuscript need to be examined before submission of a revision.