

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJRID_95857 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | An unusual case of isolated cysticercosis of breast imitating breast malignancy |
| 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:

(<https://www.journalajrid.com/index.php/AJRID/editorial-policy>)

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) |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p> | <p>1. The work that is presented is of importance in the field of medicine, however it requires a thorough review due to the fact that it presents writing errors. Some paragraphs lack bibliographic support. You must take care of the form, style, syntax and give order and coherence to what is intended to be demonstrated, in addition to avoiding repeating information (in the introduction and in the discussion - in the latter it is recommended to improve the writing - avoiding a revision bibliographical).</p> <p>In the discussion section, it is intended to be comparative with similar studies, considering in this case the studies carried out (ultrasound and histopathology) at work.</p> <p>2. The title of: An unusual case of isolated cysticercosis of breast imitating breast malignancy it is suggested to change to: Detection of a case of breast cysticercosis. Case report.</p> <p>3. It is suggested to review that it is prepared according to the guidelines referred to by the journal.</p> <p>5. It is suggested to improve the style, writing and writing of the document; which may be possible considering the information that the authors intend to demonstrate, so that an improvement is possible in form and content.</p> <p>6. Apparently there are adequate and sufficient references; there are only paragraphs without being a bibliographical support; and also review the form - correct style of the references.</p> <p>It is suggested to review the discussion section in which comparisons of similar studies should be established (avoid a bibliographic review), as well as the conclusions, since these must be specific to what the study has contributed.</p> <p>It is necessary that all the figures are described with a greater amplitude than what is intended to be highlighted - as a finding (It is suggested to mark or indicate with arrows the most evident - with a better description).</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>A minor revision is required regarding the writing of English</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>The document presents some writing details (order, syntax, style) on which it is suggested to review and work</p> | |

PART 2:

| | 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) |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p> | <p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> | |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Benjamin Valladares Carranza |
| Department, University & Country | Autonomous University of Mexico State, Mexico |