



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The authors describe a case of disseminated rhinosporidiosis and the use of FNAC in aiding diagnosis. On analysing smears from fine needle aspirates from different sites they found typical morphological features for cytological diagnosis of rhinosporidiosis. Suggestions 1.Introduction Inappropriate citations - Lines 23 – 25, 27 - 29, 30 – 32, 33 – 34 are taken word for word from references 3 (Pal et al.,) or 4 (Sinha et al.,). → It would be good to paraphrase some of these sentences. → Provide appropriate citations - the authors are in many case attributing findings to secondary sources. - Provide references for lines 35 – 37 → cite original studies showing concordance between FNAC and histopathology in diagnosing rhinosporidiosis. - Line 35 Exclude "Scrape cytology" as only FNAC was performed 2. Methods - Rewrite the section to indicate clearly which stains were used for wet smears and air-dried smears before	1. Introduction has been re-written with rephrasing of sentences. New references have been added. Sentence 35-37 has been rephrased. 2 Original studies citing cyto-histo correlation have been added. (Paragraph 5 of introduction) Scrape cytology has been deleted. Methodology and result sections have been added under heading of presentation of case.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	presenting the results. - Name all the stains that were used. - Was mucicarmin used? 3. Figure 2 - Provide the magnification for all the micrographs. - Fig 2A, 2B, 2D – arrangement suggests that the insets are a higher magnification of part of the bigger pictures. → If this is the case e.g. Fig 2D, arrows should be used to indicate which part of the 400x micrograph is shown on the 1000x image. → Adding a scale bar would aid in demonstrating the diameters of sporangia and endospores.	All stains used have been added. Mucicarmin was not used in present case. Figure 2 has been changed with magnification for all microphotographs. In Figure 2 E and F arrows have been added for demonstration of endospores. Figure 3 has been added demonstrating cytochemical stains and with a scale bar.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		