

# Review of: "Mycetoma in Animals a Review of Cases Reported From 1925-2022; Epidemiology and Management Strategies"

Mary White<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Midwestern University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

My recommendation for this manuscript is to reject it. The subject of the review is interesting, and I believe many in the veterinary field would benefit from a comprehensive literature review on the subject. However, as it is currently, this manuscript is not suitable for publication due to the following reasons listed below.

1. Grammar, inconsistencies with punctuation, and the use of conversational language in a scientific review. I would suggest recruiting the aid of someone who is proficient and familiar with scientific writing and English composition.
2. From your title and abstract, the review is supposed to focus on mycetomas in domestic animals; however, some sections had more information on human disease and history than mention of mycetomas in animals. There are also a few times where you mention a single case report of an etiologic agent species that causes mycetoma formation in a human patient but no mention of the animal counterpart.
3. The manuscript is reviewing bacterial and fungal associated mycetomas in animals, and therefore in the introduction, I would suggest including all of the mycetoma types (Actinomycetomas, Eumycetomas, and Dermatophytic mycetomas (pseudomycetomas). I would also recommend defining the clinical meaning of a mycetoma and a pseudomycetoma.
4. The organization for each section is inconsistent. For example, in the introduction, bacterial-caused mycetomas are described prior to eumycetomas; however, in the canine-specific section, you discuss fungal-associated mycetomas prior to the bacterial ones.
5. In the horse section, there is a case report in a 2 YO Jersey heifer. Since this is a cow, it should be put in the Cattle section.
6. The cattle and goat sections need to include more details in regards to presentation, pathophysiology, microscopic descriptions, etc.
7. Mycetomas are not considered to have a zoonotic transmission, and therefore all sections pertaining to zoonosis should be removed.
8. You need to have more robust microscope descriptions of the infectious agents. Addition of cytologic and histopathologic microscopic descriptions should be included as well.
9. When describing the morphology of some of the bacterial agents, you use terms that are used to describe fungal morphology (i.e., use of the term hyphae to describe filamentous bacterial chains seen with *Nocardia*).
10. I would recommend removing the time range in the title because you have some historic references that mention case

reports prior to 1925.

11. The objectives of this review, that are mentioned in the abstract, are different from the objectives you mention in the introduction.
12. Recommend complete restructuring of the review. The review needs to consistently include microscopic descriptions of agents and lesions, microbiology culture features, epidemiology, transmission, clinical presentations, diagnostic findings, confirmatory tests with results, treatment protocols, prognosis and outcome, for all the etiologic agents mentioned.
13. In the *Nocardia* and *Actinomyces* section, you mention all the disease manifestations seen in animals (i.e., cutaneous, thoracic, and abdominal). All of the clinical manifestations should be included; however, only briefly. Since the review is on mycetomas, emphasis on the cutaneous and subcutaneous manifestations should be more descriptive/ provide more information than the other manifestations (thoracic manifestation of nocardiosis and actinomycosis is pyothorax).

Thank you