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Reviewer's report:

Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

I have reviewed the modified version of the article, in fact, most of the modifications that were suggested have been corrected and the quality and legibility of the article has improved, however, it is up to the section editor to decide on its publication by the following points.

1. More than 120 of this particular form of cysticercosis have been reported and it is probably much more frequent, only that it is not detected if it is not intentionally sought.

2. One of the reasons that the authors indicate for publication is to draw attention to the control of the tapeworm in the geographical area where the case occurred, which reduces its impact to a local interest, as long as the doctors of the region have access to and read newly published articles

3. Under my criteria the skull computed tomographies are of very low quality for a publication

4. The content of the case report does not provide new aspects of disseminated cysticercosis and its main interest is the absence of previous reports in the geographic location where the patient was identified.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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