Reference animals-537035: CLINICAL PRACTICE GUIDELINES: LEGAL IMPLICATION IN VETERINARY MEDICINE

Dear Reviewer 3,

First of all, thank you for your comments and suggestions that allowed us to greatly improve the quality of the manuscript. We agree with your comments, and we corrected point by point the manuscript accordingly as follows:

Line 49: uses the term animals with disregard to specifically farm animals or companion animals. This reviewer would be hard pressed to find a pork producer with grower pigs that considers these animals as “members of the family or children or best friends…” The authors should specifically limit their discussion to “companion animals that are brought into a home environment.” The authors indiscriminately use the term, “animals,” which is too broad. We have limited our discussion to companion animals as you can read in the revised text. We have inserted a note after keywords.

Line 58: language issue, “did (not) apply (the standard of care).” We did it.

Line 63-64: the authors use the term “Civil and penal courts…” Again there are likely jurisdictional differences. For example, the USA, uses state licensing boards (not penal) to discipline veterinarians who breach the standard of care. Also, owners in the USA can use civil law via a tort action to make a claim of negligence against a veterinarian for the breach of the standard of care. This article does not make sense as the authors are trying to cover too much territory (too many different jurisdictional boundaries). Of course, there are jurisdictional differences. To avoid misunderstanding, we have deleted the words civil and penal.

In lines 101, the authors only cite American organizations without actually using their full name. We have added other associations and made a table.

Lines 108 and 109: the authors provide no citation or support for their statement. The authors fail to include a discussion about the potential for emergency exemptions. We have reformulated the phrase and added examples.
Lines 150-151: does not make sense. If a result of legislation, then in the English based law countries legislation = law.  
We have changed the sentence.

Lines 183-192: the authors fail to use appropriate English language to make the sword and shield argument. This reviewer suggests that the authors seek out someone who can assist with their English language edits.  
We have deleted the words sword and shield.

After line 216: a logical addition would be the decline by the owner to apply the CPG and the effect to the practice of veterinary medicine.  
We have added some reflections.

Lines 230-233: very confusing and not sure what the authors are trying to say.  
We have revised the sentence

Lines 242-243: veterinarian’s duty is also imposed by law (not just the veterinary profession itself). There are licensing requirements in specific countries.  
Of course, we have added the adverb “also”.

Best regards,

Prof. Annamaria Passantino