

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_81583
Title of the Manuscript:	Anaesthetic Management of Anaphylactic Shock Caused by ruptured Hydatid Cyst of the Liver: A case report
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>On Reviewing article I would like to make following comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1.The authors mentioned patient had tenderness in abdomen and pleural effusion ,ascitis however have not explained the significance and cause of these findings.2.authors have not mentioned Details of surgical procedure and whether the cyst got ruptured accidentally neither have they mentioned in what situations likelihood of anaphylaxis risk becomes high.3.They mentioned hydrocortisone was given before surgery but did not mention whether it is be given Routinely or there was any special reasons specific to this case.4.They have described the case report under several subheadings which is not the usual format used by most of the journals for manuscripts for case reports	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript may be accepted for publication with minor changes</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The steps described by the author are same routine steps which everyone uses for treating cardiogenic shock subsequent to ruptured hydatid cyst and there is nothing special in the case report or in the discussion that would generate further interest of readers So author should put in more efforts to bring out something special to make the article valuable</p>	

Review Form 1.6

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>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Deepak Puri
Department, University & Country	Max Super Speciality Hospital Mohali, India