

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Dermatological Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRDES_124527
Title of the Manuscript:	Mycetomas in Senegal: the impact of reduced rainfall on mapping expansion and the new aetiological profile.
Type of the Article	Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it highlights the critical relationship between climate change and the spread of neglected tropical diseases (NTDs), specifically mycetomas in Senegal. By demonstrating how reduced rainfall has expanded the geographic range of mycetomas, the study provides valuable insights into the environmental determinants of disease and their public health implications. I appreciate the manuscript's comprehensive use of long-term data and its clear connection to global climate trends, which can serve as a model for similar studies in other regions affected by climate change. However, I believe the study could benefit from deeper exploration of genetic and socio-economic factors, which would provide a more holistic understanding of the disease's impact.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>It's quite suitable. However, a more concise and engaging alternative could be: "Impact of Climate Change on Mycetomas in Senegal: Expanding Range and Shifting Aetiology."</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive as it outlines the key objectives, methodology, results, and conclusion of the study. It provides a clear summary of the investigation into the relationship between reduced rainfall and the expansion of mycetomas in Senegal, as well as the aetiological transition between fungal and bacterial forms of the disease.</p> <p>Suggested Additions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Specific Data Points: Include the total number of cases studied and mention key statistical findings (e.g., the significant correlation between rainfall and mycetoma types) to give a clearer picture of the scope and significance of the results. Public Health Implications: Briefly highlight the public health impact of these findings and the challenges in treatment, especially for fungal mycetomas, to emphasize the real-world importance. <p>Suggested Deletions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Too Much Detail on Methodology: While the methods are important, some detailed information (like the use of SPSS software or isohyets data specifics) could be omitted in the abstract to allow more space for impactful results and conclusions. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate and well-organized.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound as it is based on a well-structured retrospective study that spans over two decades, allowing for comprehensive data collection and analysis. The use of rainfall data over several decades to correlate with mycetoma distribution ensures that the findings are grounded in environmental and epidemiological trends. The statistical analysis, including the use of SPSS and significance testing, provides credibility to the results, particularly the correlation between rainfall and the prevalence of different types of mycetomas. Furthermore, the study is thorough in its regional and etiological analysis, making it a valuable contribution to understanding how climate change impacts disease dynamics.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript are mostly sufficient, but many of them are relatively dated, with some key studies from the 1990s and early 2000s. While these older references are foundational, more recent literature should be incorporated to strengthen the manuscript, especially given the dynamic</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>=</p>	<p>nature of climate change and advancements in mycetoma research.</p> <p>Suggestions for Additional References:</p> <p>Recent Global Mycetoma Research: New studies from regions like Sudan or other countries impacted by mycetomas, which might provide comparative data or new insights into epidemiology and treatment.</p> <p>Climate Change and Disease Distribution: Recent research on climate change's impact on the spread of tropical diseases beyond mycetomas, which could offer broader context for the findings.</p> <p>Advances in Mycetoma Treatment: Literature that covers recent advancements in the treatment of eumycetomas, especially studies published after 2020.</p> <p>Including more recent references would enhance the manuscript's relevance and show engagement with the latest developments in the field.</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are areas where improvements can be made to enhance clarity and readability.</p> <p>Suggested Improvements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grammar and Sentence Structure: Some sentences could be rephrased for better clarity and conciseness. For instance, long, complex sentences can be broken into shorter, more digestible parts. • Scientific Terminology: Ensure that all scientific terms are used consistently throughout the manuscript. For example, using "fungal mycetoma" or "eumycetoma" consistently rather than switching between terms will help maintain clarity. • Transitions Between Sections: Adding smoother transitions between sections can improve the flow of the narrative, making it easier for readers to follow the argument and logic. 	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript offers valuable insights into the impact of climate change on the distribution and aetiology of mycetomas in Senegal, addressing a critical public health issue. Its comprehensive analysis of long-term data and the integration of climate and epidemiological trends is commendable. However, there are a few areas where the paper could be strengthened:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarity and Conciseness: Simplifying some of the more complex sentences and improving transitions between sections would enhance readability. 2. Updated References: Incorporating more recent studies, especially in the areas of climate change, disease distribution, and treatment advances, would make the manuscript more current and relevant. 3. Discussion of Socio-Economic Impact: Expanding on the socio-economic implications of mycetomas on rural populations could offer a more holistic view of the disease's burden. 4. Graphical Enhancements: The inclusion of more detailed and higher-quality maps or graphs would help visualize the correlation between rainfall and disease distribution more effectively. <p>Overall, this is a solid contribution to the field, with minor revisions needed to elevate the quality and impact of the manuscript.</p> <p>Based on the overall assessment of the manuscript, I would assign a mark of 8 (Minor Revision).</p> <p>With these minor revisions, the manuscript could be suitable for publication.</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	M. Indhumathy
Department, University & Country	PSNA College of Engineering and Technology, India