

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Medical and Pharmaceutical Case Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJMPCR_116007
Title of the Manuscript:	Brain Meningioma Mimicking Eclampsia: A Report of Two Cases
Type of the Article	Case Study

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.journalijmpcr.com/index.php/IJMPCR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. without access to the full content of the manuscript, including detailed methodology, data analysis, and results sections, it's challenging to assess the scientific accuracy comprehensively. 2. The title effectively summarizes the essence of the article. However, it might benefit from being more specific, such as mentioning "intracranial meningiomas" to provide clarity. 3. The abstract provides a concise overview of the cases presented. Consider including a brief mention of the outcomes or implications discussed in the main text. 4. Both cases are presented clearly, including relevant patient demographics, clinical history, and diagnostic findings. Consider adding subsection headings for each case to improve readability. 5. Overall, while the provided information suggests that the manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. add more recent references, if available, to ensure the latest evidence is represented. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The conclusion appropriately summarizes the key findings and emphasizes the multidisciplinary approach to management. • Consider reinforcing the main takeaway points or recommendations for clinical practice in the conclusion. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	The language and English quality of the article seem generally suitable for scholarly communication.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The discussion effectively explores the relationship between pregnancy and brain tumors, providing insights into epidemiology, pathogenesis, and management. • Provide more detailed discussion on the diagnostic challenges and potential differential diagnoses that clinicians may encounter. • Including comparative analyses or contrasting viewpoints from existing literature could enrich the discussion section. 	

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anjali Kapoor
Department, University & Country	Amity University Noida, India