



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJMMR_17582
Title of the Manuscript:	Immediate Adverse Reactions and Anaphylaxis associated with gadolinium-based contrast agents in a patient with meningioma: case report and literature review
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>I thank the authors for this interesting paper. A few comments are to be made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. He abstract is not structured and lacks clarity. 2. The introduction is not clear. No discussion on the incidence and the <u>type</u> of hypersensitivity reactions, the difference between Gadolinium chelates and Gadobenatedimeglumine (the sentence of it having different renal excretion is short and not clear at all). 3. The introduction sentences: "The incidence of immediate hypersensitivity reactions to MR contrast media was 0.079%, and the recurrence rate of hypersensitivity reactions was 30% in patients with previous reactions. " requires formatting and explanation – what type of hypersensitivity reactions is included in this number, what contrast media? 4. The authors continue to quote some past paper without mentioning it, having sentences in the introduction like "The risk factors for immediate hypersensitivity reactions to MR contrast media were the female sex, allergies and asthma". 5. The authors should distinguish between urticarial, type-I hypersensitivity, anaphylactoid reaction and anaphylactic shock. 6. The introduction is filled with sentences copied from other papers, not put in context (line 52, taken completely and out of context from Acad Radiol 1999;6:656-664). 7. Patient description is extremely lacking. Comorbidities, past medical history, immune status, current medications, further investigation in the immune and allergy clinic etc... 8. The discussion, like the introduction has no structure, leading nowhere and is basically a collection of paragraphs taken from other papers. 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>9. If the authors suggest a relation to the meningioma, it should be discussed and proven. Meningiomas are known to have hormone receptors. Are any Mast-cell surface markers found in the meningioma? What is the pathophysiological link?</p> <p>10. What is the aim of figure 1?</p> <p>11. What is the conclusion?</p> <p>plagiarism issues -: Please check the paper, many sentences and paragraphs are copy-pasted from older papers. I am attaching one example. since many of the sentences in the paper seem out of place and copied, this aroused my suspicion. a simple copy paste search in google should show much more. i am not claiming complete plagiarism, rather that complete sentences are copied, at times out of place with without referencing or putting into "".</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Grammar and structure Not figure legend	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	University of Virginia Health Care Center, USA