



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_20362
Title of the Manuscript:	Cysticercosis – is it a Pathological or Radiological diagnosis?
Type of the Article	Case Study

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Line 18: The authors should change "...taenia solium..." by ...<i>Taenia solium</i>...; Line 18: Please, authors can clarify why <i>Taenia solium</i> is a modern plague? Line 24: The authors should change "...year old..." by ...year-old...; Lines 26 and 27: The authors should change "...Oral examination and other ENT examination..." by Oral and other Ear, Nose and Throat examination examination; Line 27: Please, clarify the acronym "ENT". It is the first time that this acronym appears. So write Ear, Nose and Throat examination (ENT); Line 31: The authors should change "...year old..." by ...year-old...; Line 31: The authors should change "...with awareness of swelling in..." by ...with swelling in...; Line 36: Is Gadolinium enhanced MRI the same as CEMRI? In affirmative case, please, choose one of them; Lines 48 and 49: The authors should change "...Faecal-oral infection, Faecal-oral autoinfection and Internal autoinfection..." by ...faecal-oral infection, faecal-oral autoinfection and internal autoinfection... It is not necessary use capital letters; Line 53: The authors should change "...Neck..." by ...neck... It is not necessary use capital letter; Line 55: The authors should change "...Mucous..." by ...mucous... It is not necessary use capital letter; Line 145: Please, clarify the acronym "CEMRI". It is the first time that this acronym appears. So write contrast-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging (CEMRI);	Agreed. Corrected. Highlighted
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This is a very interesting report on cysticercosis. I believe that the discussion can be enriched with other articles, such as: 1 – F.N. Santos, F. N. S. Soares, C. L. Macedo, R. O. SOUZA, A. R. Santos, C. A. S. Gurgel, F. L. N Santos. A Brazilian Case of Tongue Cysticercosis. <i>Advances in Infectious Diseases</i>, v. 2, p. 106-109, 2012. doi:10.4236/aid.2012.24018; 2 - H. Yamasaki, T. Nagase, Y. Kiyoshige, M. Suzuki, K. Nakaya, Y. Itoh, Y. Saco, M. Nakao and A. Ito, "A Case of Intramuscular Cysticercosis Diagnosed Definitively by Mitochondrial DNA Analysis of Extremely Calcified Cysts," <i>Parasitology International</i>, Vol. 55, No. 2, 2006, pp. 127-130. doi:10.1016/j.parint.2005.11.057; 3 - M. Lakhey, S. Hirachand, J. Akhter and B. Thapa, "Cysticerci in Palpable Nodules Diagnosed on Fine Needle Aspiration Cytology," <i>Journal of Nepal Medical Association</i>, Vol. 48, No. 176, 2009, pp. 314-317; 4 - F. M. Elias, M. T. Martins, R. Foronda, W. A. Jorge and N. S. de Araújo, "Oral Cysticercosis: Case Report and Review of the Literature," <i>Revista do Instituto de Medicina Tropical de São Paulo</i>, Vol. 47, No. 2, 2005, pp. 95-98. doi:10.1590/S0036-46652005000200007; D. Mahajan, N. Khurana and N. Setia, "Coexistence of Salivary Gland Cysticercosis with Squamous Cell Carcinoma of the Mandible," <i>Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine, Oral Pathology, Oral Radiology, and Endodontology</i>, Vol. 103, No. 3, 2007, pp. 47-50. doi:10.1016/j.tripleo.2006.10.001. And the excisional biopsy? Was she performed? And the morphological findings? Please, comment about it. Ethical issues: The authors used the face image of patients. Furthermore, one of them is a child. Was this manuscript submitted to a Ethics Committee? To be accepted the manuscript have to be submit to a Ethical	Agreed. Cannot add much more to the manuscript due to word limitations and confines of type of article. I am attaching a revised manuscript without the picyures of the face.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Committee.	As far as the points raised regarding ethical clearance, please note that 1. Present case study is a diagnostic dilemma which is usually encountered in evaluation of swelling in Head and neck. With huge differential diagnosis, presentation being similar in all such possibilities, diagnosis is almost dependent on pathological and/or radiological investigations. Therefore in present case study, diagnostic approach and role of investigations is more important than clinical picture, which is not new to the literature. 2. Present study is a retrospective case study which does not involve any animal or human directly or indirectly. Its just the differences in role played by choice of investigation, and its impact on clinical scenario. We highlight the differences in various technology and tools developed and utilised by clinicians in day to day clinics. Study about differences in these techniques does not involve human and should not require ethical clearance. I think the above explanation would be satisfactory and our manuscript can be processed further.
--	------------	---