

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

Leidi Herrera<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidad Central de Venezuela

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

A comprehensive and well-structured review that will undoubtedly be a good contribution to the knowledge of neglected zoonoses and saproscoses.

In terms of content, it is recommended to talk about the concept of generalist aetiological agents for this review of mycetoma and to delve into the particular conditions of the host to define why this is such a generalist association, with more than one agent of pathological action,

It would be enlightening to see if there are differences in the species that cause mycetoma in terms of geographical distribution.

From a diagnostic point of view, it is recommended to cite the most recent approaches in technology, such as barcoding, for example.

To reinforce this very comprehensive and structured review, bringing the concept of One Health to the analysis of mycetoma would be an excellent complement.

References that are recommended to review and include if not reiterative:

Asokan GV, Asokan V. Bradford Hill's criteria, emerging zoonoses, and One Health. *J Epidemiol Glob Health*. 2016 Sep;6(3):125-9. doi: 10.1016/j.jegh.2015.10.002. Epub 2015 Nov 14. PMID: 26589252; PMCID: PMC710411

**Siddig EE, Nyuykonge B, Mhmoud NA, et al. Comparing the performance of the commonly used eumycetoma diagnostic tests. *Mycoses*. 2023;66:420-429. doi:10.1111/myc.13561**

Wendy van de Sande, Ahmed Fahal, Sarah Abdalla Ahmed, Julian Alberto Serrano, Alexandro Bonifaz, Ed Zijlstra, on behalf of the eumycetoma working group, Closing the mycetoma knowledge gap, *Medical Mycology*, Volume 56, Issue suppl\_1, April 2018, Pages S153–S164, <https://doi.org/10.1093/mmy/myx061>