

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

Carla Dedola

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The manuscript has an extended collection of information derived from a good literature research of what is known and published on mycetoma to date; however, it is a bit confusing in part because it is not written in fluent and correct English and in part because it lacks a clear classification of the disease itself. Can be accepted after major review. I report some of the aspects to be addressed as follows, although there are many more.

In the abstract and in the introduction, the author refers to mycosis only, but as he indicates, mycetoma can be fungal and bacterial in origin.

In the second paragraph of the part referred to as "Etiology of Mycetoma: Historical Aspects," the author refers to human? Or animals? It is not specified.

He also introduces the "black grain mycetoma" without specifying anywhere what exactly it means; may be a classification at the beginning of the same paragraph might help in understanding.

Pag. 3: In the figure, the letters A, B, and C do not appear. It is easy to understand to what they are referred if they are also indicated in the figure and not only in the legend.

Pag. 4: It is not clear what the actual differences are between actinomycetoma and actinomycosis; may be the author referred to the fact that actinomycosis is caused by normal inhabitants of animals and actinomycetoma from organisms deriving from the environment? Or what else? Localization? Characteristics of the lesions? Anyway, this should be mentioned. Or maybe the author wants to say that it is important to differentiate actinomycetoma from actinomycosis and nocardiosis?

Pag. 5: I would include the paragraph "transmission" in "Etiology of Mycetoma: Historical Aspects," maybe calling it "Aetiopathogenesis of Mycetoma: Historical Aspects." In the same paragraph, it is not clear what the author wants to say. My interpretation is that in human mycetoma is considered an occupational disorder based on route of transmission, however, this is not true for animals, where the infection can be present with different types of transmission. Is that the correct interpretation? If yes, it should be explained better, as many other statements of the manuscript are not easy to interpret.

Paragraph on "Canine Mycetoma": It is not clear the difference between dermatophytotic pseudomycetoma and

eumycetoma. I would clarify the classification and differential at the beginning of this paragraph.

The term “mycetoma” is used interchangeably even when it is known that the author is talking of eumycetoma; it would be less confusing if at least when known, the author refers to eumycetoma or actinomycetoma.

Check the references; there are some errors in the spelling or in the names (for example, Francesca et al. is the name of the author, while Abramo et al. should be the right name).

Pag. 8 I would not talk about cats in this paragraph; all the written information about this species is also written in the paragraph dedicated to cats.

Pag. 9 The summaries of cases of the most common agents are already written at the beginning of the same paragraph.

Pag. 9 It is again very confusing, the differentiation between infections caused by commensal/opportunistic pathogens and pathogens coming from the environment.

In general, it is suggested that you:

1. Review the English to avoid misinterpretation of concepts and to allow a better comprehension of the text.
2. Write an appropriate and orderly classification of mycetoma and refer to it in every paragraph, always using the same term while describing a specific type.
3. Review all the typos and incorrect references.