

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

D Smith

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The author has obviously done an immense amount of work pulling references from many years of published literature and is to be commended for amalgamating them into a single review. However, the organization of the paper requires reworking to render it suitable for publication. While the section topics are appropriate, the order in which information is presented is confusing, repetitive, and sometimes appears contradictory.

The author should consider how a reader not familiar with the subject would gain impressions as they read the paper. For example, the first paragraph comments on fungal diseases overall, with little specificity. The second paragraph starts off talking about zoonoses and half-way through mentions mycetoma, but gives the impression that this is not a zoonotic disease. The disease has not been introduced, and a reader might have no idea at this point what mycetoma is. The abstract, which does define mycetoma, is a separate stand-alone section and should not be necessary to understand the introduction of the paper. I suggest reworking the introduction to provide general information about mycetoma: what its definition is, the difference between eumycetoma and actinomycotic mycetoma, and a general comment about where these organisms are found and the major routes of infection. If the author then wishes to delve more deeply into the microbiology and infectivity of these agents, the scene will be set, and the reader can follow the train of thought.

The first part of the section "Etiology of Mycetoma: Historical Aspects" would make a much better introduction to the paper – it sets the scene. The remainder of this section could be used to provide additional details on the responsible microorganism. The phrase "historic aspects" is not necessary; it is apparent that this article is a review rather than a case report. Figure 1 is beautifully done; however, some corrections in the use of the English language are needed. I did not compare the details of this figure to the details in the text to ensure that they are congruent.

The section on transmission repeats information provided elsewhere but does not describe transfer from animals to man, although it is mentioned elsewhere and is included in Figure 1. It is therefore incomplete.

There is considerable overlap between the etiology section and the sections pertaining to specific animal groups. As well, information within the species sections is not narrow enough in scope. For example, in the "Canine Case Report" section, there is information on other species and then some general pathologic comments. This mixing is confusing to the reader. The author should decide whether to organize the material by microorganism or by species affected, but not by both.

Since the pathology of the disease is critical to its definition, characteristic findings should be highlighted rather than

interspersed within the case reports.

The therapeutic section needs reworking. The introductory sentence is confusing: “The two major factors for successful management of mycetoma patients are better identification of the causative agents and better prevention and treatment of infection.” Prevention, while important, is not a method of managing a case. While a number of therapies and their success, or lack of success, are outlined, there is no synopsis of why these agents might or might not work on the organisms of interest. Is it a matter of lack of sensitivity or a problem getting the agent to the site? Are there characteristic(s) of the organism that influence the choice of therapeutic agent? This would help explain why certain therapeutic choices might be made. At the end of this section are some concluding statements that do not relate specifically to this section and do not summarize the conclusions of the entire paper. A separate, overall conclusion section would be more appropriate.

Based on the geographic origin of the paper, I assume that English is not the first language of the author. While the writing is adequate, there are a number of grammatical and spelling errors, and some of the phrasing is very awkward. I suggest that a native English speaker be asked to do a detailed review of the manuscript with the purpose of identifying and correcting these language issues.

I consider this manuscript to be a good draft of an informative paper, but in my opinion, it requires major reorganization and rewriting, as well as improvement in the use of language, in order to be publishable in an English language environment.