

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	

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. This manuscript is important for the scientific community, particularly for healthcare practitioners involved in obstetrics, neurology, and neurosurgery. It highlights the challenges in diagnosing brain tumors, particularly meningiomas, in pregnant patients presenting with symptoms mimicking eclampsia. The cases presented underscore the need for thorough paraclinical examinations to avoid diagnostic delays and errors, ultimately improving patient outcomes and informing clinical practice. 2. The title of the article, "Brain Meningioma Mimicking Eclampsia: A Report of Two Cases," effectively conveys the main focus of the manuscript. It accurately summarizes the content and the key findings discussed in the report. Therefore, the title is suitable for the article. 3. The abstract of the article provides a comprehensive overview of the cases presented, the challenges in diagnosis, and the importance of paraclinical examinations in ruling out cerebral expansive processes in pregnant patients with symptoms suggestive of eclampsia. It effectively summarizes the main findings and sets the stage for the discussion that follows. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear appropriate. The manuscript follows a clear and logical flow, beginning with the introduction, followed by case presentations, discussion, and conclusion. Each section is well-defined, making it easy for readers to follow the narrative and understand the key points presented. 5. The manuscript appears scientifically correct based on the information provided. It presents two clinical cases supported by imaging findings and discusses the relevant literature to contextualize the cases and provide additional insights. However, without access to the full manuscript, it's challenging to assess the completeness of the scientific content comprehensively. 6. The references provided appear to cover relevant literature, including case reports, theses, and medical articles. However, without access to the full reference list, it's difficult to determine the sufficiency and recency comprehensively. It may be beneficial to ensure that the references are up-to-date and include a diverse range of sources to support the discussion adequately. Additionally, recent research or guidelines related to the diagnosis and management of brain tumors during pregnancy could enhance the manuscript's relevance and completeness. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Based on the provided abstract and review, the language and English quality of the article appear suitable for scholarly communications. The abstract is well-structured, clear, and effectively communicates the main findings of the study.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pranav Chippalkatti
Department, University & Country	MIT ADT University, India