

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Medical Genetics

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8375

Title: Genetics of Canine Behavior- A Review

Reviewer code: 02765428

Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song

Date sent for review: 2013-12-28 13:39

Date reviewed: 2014-03-20 03:05

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The subject of the review, behavioral genetics in dogs, is one that would likely be of interest to a large number of readers. Previous reviews on the subject are from 2008 and 2012. Significant progress has been made on several phenotypes since then, including flank or blanket sucking, tail chasing, separation anxiety, impulsivity, aggression, but sadly these are not the primary focus of this review. Much of the material covered is dated and already thoroughly reviewed, such as domestication and narcolepsy. In general, the manuscript does not reflect the title and is disjointed. For example, nearly a third of the article reviews canine domestication. While certain aspects of this subject (e.g., phenotyping of the farm foxes) could be tied into behavioral genetics, domestication studies largely concern the location and time of the separation of dogs and wolves. Another example of a topic that seems out of place is sled dogs on page 13. I don't think of endurance and speed as a behavior, but rather a physical attribute. Several topics address behavior and physiology, but not much genetics, such those covered in blood and body fluids and brain receptors for neurotransmitters. Another concern is that the material presented is excessively thorough. Several studies are mentioned in only a single sentence, as if just to acknowledge them, and do not serve to expand upon a thought. For example, line 181: "Another study employed mitochondrial DNA sequencing, showing a closer relationship of dogs to gray wolves from East Asia." Because this is not elaborated upon in the review, it would be better to cite this article with the sentence from line 160: "Where canine domestication originated from remains debatable." Many sentences describing genetic concepts are wordy, confusing, and sometimes inaccurate. For example, line 117: "The use of SNP markers is a valuable tool that can provide quantitative information about gene expression in tissue samples



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: editorialoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

derived from tame and aggressive foxes and will help identify genes implicated in behavior.” SNP markers are not generally used to study expression. I recommend that the authors identify a geneticist who is willing to review, or contribute to, a revision. Presentation of non-genetic material is at times equaling confounding (e.g., those starting on lines 52, 144, 278, 478, 521, and 562). Sentences throughout are lacking needed citations. It would be nice to have figures or tables to break up the text. One paragraph was written twice – starting on line 581 and again on line 668.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Medical Genetics

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8375

Title: Genetics of Canine Behavior- A Review

Reviewer code: 02658287

Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song

Date sent for review: 2013-12-28 13:39

Date reviewed: 2014-03-22 23:33

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

See uploaded document.