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Reviewer’s report:

1. Do you believe the case report is authentic?

Yes

2. Do you have any ethical concerns? Please consider if local Institutional Review Board approval or ethical approval was obtained (if appropriate) and if the patient (or their parent or guardian in the case of children under 18) gave written, informed consent to publish this case and any accompanying images. A statement to this effect should appear in the manuscript.

Comments: no

3. Does the Introduction explain the relevance of the case to the medical literature?

Yes

4. Does the article report the following information? Where information is missing, please specify.

   a. The relevant patient information, including:
      - De-identified demographic information (age, gender, ethnicity)
      - Main symptoms of the patient
      - Medical, family and psychosocial history
      - Relevant past interventions and their outcomes

   b. The relevant physical examination findings

   c. Important dates and times in this case (if appropriate, organized as a timeline via a figure or table); if specific dates could lead to patient identification, consider including
time relevant to initial presentation, i.e. initial presentation at $T = 0$, follow up at $T = 1$ month.

d. Diagnostic assessments, including:

- Diagnostic methods
- Challenges (e.g., financial, language/cultural)
- Reasoning and prognostic characteristics (e.g., staging), where applicable

e. Types and mechanism of intervention

f. A summary of the clinical course of all follow-up visits

Comments: none

5. Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the case presented?

Comments: see below

6. Is the anonymity of the patient protected? Please consider any identifying information in images such as facial features or nametags, whether the patient is named etc. If not, please detail below.

Yes

7. Is the Abstract representative of the case presented?

Comments: yes

8. Does the case represent a useful contribution to the medical literature?

Comments: yes

9. Additional comments for the author(s)?

This submission reviews case series of cysticercosis obtained by FNAC, and as a part of cytology procedure ROSE using Toluidine blue was performed. I enjoyed reading through the cases and supporting material as the topic is intriguing and limited literature is available on the
use of FNAC ROSE for early detection of cysticercosis. However, the language used by the authors does not flow simply due to word choice, incorrect verb forms, etc. (for example-"increase" instead of "rise" Page 4 Line 11 {Case 1 }; "bath" instead of "bathing" in Page 5 Line 2 ; also articles are missing in several parts, etc.). I would suggest reviewing the English language carefully by professional proofreader before further consideration.

My specific comments about the submission include the following:

- Please make concise and pertinent case presentation.
- In the discussion please elaborate on the diagnostic role of FNAC-ROSE.
- Also please involve in the discussion if FNAC-ROSE can obviate the need of open biopsy.
- Include in the discussion the chances of finding the actual parasite in clear aspirate
- Also mention, regarding the parasites found in the different types of aspirates. (Purulent, hemorrhagic and clear).
- Kindly, elaborate the pathogenesis of cysticercosis and clinical manifestations.

**Level of interest**
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article of importance in its field

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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