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NO ACTION IS REQUIRED FROM YOU

Reviewer 1 and Reviewer 2 is/are pending to respond in the discussion forum.

Reviewer 1
Independent review report submitted: 03 Apr 2017
Interactive review activated: 04 Apr 2017
Q1 Does this manuscript conform to the definition below of Original Research articles? If not, please contact the Frontiers Editorial Office (editorial.office@frontiersin.org).

*Original Research articles describe the hypothesis, study, and methods of original research. Results are reported, interpreted and may include a discussion of possible implications. They may also encompass disconfirming results allowing hypothesis elimination, reformulation; or they may report on the non-reproducibility of previously published results. The manuscript should include the following: Abstract, Introduction, Material and Methods, Results, Discussion.*

Review 1 | 03 Apr 2017 | 12:16
Yes

Q2 Is the language, specifically the grammar, of sufficient quality? If no, please specify if the authors should send this manuscript to an expert in English editing and academic writing.

Review 1 | 03 Apr 2017 | 12:16
Yes

Q3 What are the main findings reported in this manuscript?

Review 1 | 03 Apr 2017 | 12:16
see S3/Q15 other Comments

Q4 Does the title clearly and precisely reflect the findings of the manuscript, as described in the author guidelines?
**Q 5** Please comment on the Abstract section. Potential aspects to consider:
- appropriateness of context
- purpose of study

Reviewer 1 | 03 Apr 2017 | 12:16
see S3/Q15 other Comments

**Q 6** Please comment on the Introduction section. Potential aspects to consider:
- appropriateness of context
- purpose of study

Reviewer 1 | 03 Apr 2017 | 12:16
see S3/Q15 other Comments

**Q 7** Please comment on the Material and Methods section. Potential aspects to consider:
- objective errors
- correct choice of methods
- comprehensive description of methods
- accuracy of procedures
- quality of figures and tables

Reviewer 1 | 03 Apr 2017 | 12:16
see S3/Q15 other Comments
Q 8 Are the statistical methods used valid?

Reviewer 1 | 03 Apr 2017 | 12:16
Not Applicable

Q 9 Has the work been conducted in conformity with the ethical standards of the field?

Reviewer 1 | 03 Apr 2017 | 12:16
Not Applicable

Q 10 For research involving human subjects or animals, do the author(s) identify the committee approving the studies and provide confirmation that all studies conform to the relevant regulatory standards?

Reviewer 1 | 03 Apr 2017 | 12:16
Not Applicable

Q 11 For research involving biohazards, have the correct standard procedures been carried out?

Reviewer 1 | 03 Apr 2017 | 12:16
Not Applicable

Q 12 Please comment on the Results section. Potential aspects to consider:

- objective errors
- correct presentation of results
- quality of figures and tables
Q 13  For any complementary data (e.g. nucleotide/amino acid sequences, crystallographic or NMR data, microarray data) submitted to an online repository or database, do the author(s) provide the accession number?

Reviewer 1 | 03 Apr 2017 | 12:16
Not Applicable

DISCUSSION

Q 14  Please comment on the Discussion section. Potential aspects to consider:
- adequate discussion of research questions or hypothesis (posed in introduction)
- conclusions supported by data
- exhaustive discussion of previously published material (in context to current study)

Reviewer 1 | 03 Apr 2017 | 12:16
see S3/Q15 other Comments

S3. OTHER COMMENTS

Q 15  Please add here any further comments on this manuscript.

Reviewer 1 | 03 Apr 2017 | 12:16
The forum in action

Reviewer 1:

Yes
The authors must indicate the ethical approval from their institution to perform this study.

Author:

We apologize, but we are unable to provide a specific ethical approval notification for this study. At our institution, ethical approval is not required for a retrospective study such as this. No client identifying information is present in the manuscript and we report only data that was collected as part of the veterinarian-directed clinical care of patients treated at our hospital.

Reviewer 2:

The same situation exists at my institution. When similar concerns have come up, our investigators have been advised to include a statement to the effect that "...consultation with the Institutional welfare committee determined that the study was exempt from oversight." The committee cites exemption for the reasons mentioned by the authors.

Reviewer 1:

In my opinion, the opinion of reviewer number 2 must be taken into account.
Things to consider

• Took a little time getting used to
• Most questions get one word answers (Frontiers knows this) and review is summarized in one question
• Download a copy of the review for facilitating responses
• Some ambivalence by reviewers to having names published
Some questions for you….

• How do we get better reviews?
• How do we get more timely reviews?
• How do we or should we incentivize reviewers?
• How do we or should we incentivize the editorial board?