

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_80150
Title of the Manuscript:	CASE REPORT OF MAGGOT INFESTATION ON DIABETIC FOOT ULCER
Type of the Article	

### 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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Editing by a native English speaker is essential. Grammar checking is necessary, as there are many missing spaces between words.</li><li>• Every line in the abstract before “A case of 55-...” should be deleted. All that prior text is introduction material, not appropriate for an abstract.</li><li>• Family Calliphoridae, order Diptera: no italicization. <i>Cochniomyia hominivorax</i> is not a family, but a species, and it rarely affects humans. Most causes of wound/traumatic myiasis in humans would probably be other species of Calliphoridae like <i>Lucillia</i> or <i>hormia</i></li><li>• The introduction should not be divided into sections at all.</li><li>• Section 1.1 on the life cycle of a fly must be deleted. It is not specific enough to myiasis, and the information is both widely known and not useful for the context of this paper.</li><li>• Figure 1 must be deleted. It is both not necessary and plagiarized.</li><li>• Section 1.2 should be reformatted into a single paragraph</li><li>• Section 1.3 is redundant with the earlier parts of the introduction. Much of it can be deleted or moved earlier.</li><li>• Table 1 needs to cite the sources for this information. It could also be deleted, as none of this information pertains to the case.</li><li>• Section 2: It is not clear when the patient was prescribed medication relative to when the maggots were discovered. All this information should be written in Chronological order, with the hospitals or clinics involved in each step and the number of doctors' visits for these different tests and treatments identified.</li><li>• Section 3 starts as a repeat of what is said in the discussion. Never repeat information from the introduction in the discussion, especially not in a paper this short.</li><li>• It is not clear here why the pharmacist recommends what they recommend. For example, why are antihelminths mentioned in the discussion when they are not mentioned at all in the rest of the paper? Also, aren't antihelminthic drugs for nematodes? Where is the evidence for using them?</li><li>• Are there no photos of the maggot infested wound? How many maggots were removed from it? What species of insect were they?</li></ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• First sentence of introduction can be deleted.</li></ul>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Figure 1 is plagiarized: <a href="http://www.ambassadorforthebluebirds.net/uploads/1/8/2/4/18248337/6281678_orig.jpg">http://www.ambassadorforthebluebirds.net/uploads/1/8/2/4/18248337/6281678_orig.jpg</a>	

**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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Matan Shelomi
Department, University & Country	National Taiwan University, Taiwan