



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_33978
Title of the Manuscript:	CYTODIAGNOSIS OF DISSEMINATED RHINOSPORIDIOSIS - A CASE REPORT
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The document have two aims as highlighted. The results and methodology are missing. Stains did not highlight the organisms.	Methodology and results have been added. Microphotograph depicting the Cytochemical stains has been added (Figure 3). The organisms have been delineated with yellow circle and arrows in the figure.
Minor REVISION comments	Scientific naming of organism Possible missed diagnosis for leprosy.	Scientific naming of organism done at all places. Leprosy does not come in the differential diagnosis of rhinosporidiosis both clinically and on microscopy.
Optional/General comments	Information not flowing, check literature review	Rephrasing and grammatical correction have been done throughout the text.