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Reviewer's report:

The authors made important efforts to improve their manuscript and this reviewer congratulates them for this. However, this reviewer has the following comments, even after this improved version of the paper:

Major issues: it is unfortunate that this ms lacks tryptase levels in plasma, as well as the lack of histamine control in skin testing. However, as a reviewer, I realize that these issues cannot be undone and that it will be the Editor's final decision to 'judge' these. However, the authors should take care, in the future, when confronted with alike situations, to address these two important issues. Meanwhile, it has no sense to look after 'excuses' for not having done tryptase testing nor histamine control in the actual version of the paper; the authors should simply state they did not perform them! See further.

Minor/detailed issues:

page 3, background: leave out 'lower' clinical doses; these are the doses most used for the drug. They are not lower, they are simply doses so often used in clinical practice.

In the case presentations: state propofol, remifentanil, and rocuronium: in that order, as administered in clinical practice; I assume the authors did not give a N MBA before remi?

Case 2: state that you gave 130mg of propofol, the reader has no message in that it was given in two boluses.

You should mention that the resuscitating drugs were given intravenously, or via an alternative route.

Page 7: leave out 'because our focus was on treating anaphylaxis'; just state that you did not do the blood tests.

Page 8: prick or intradermal tests 'in the operating room'; you have no facility to do these allergy tests? You really do these allergy testing in the OR?

Page 9: delete 'relatively low clinical doses'. Same comment for the next sentence.

Leave out the 2 sentences following ref 18 (end of first paragraph): replace them by stating that 'unfortunately, you did not monitor for NM transmission'.

Page 9 and 10: the data on sugammadex and its usage in Japan is interesting and is of value for the paper; however, are there really no means in properly referencing these? Even if it is a Japanese ref or a web-site etc. I am a bit afraid
that these issues do not come solely from the authors, and that thus appropriate referencing is required.

Major comment on the last paragraph of the discussion: as in my first review, delete the first sentence ('Sugammadex.....resuscitation material'); I disagree with most of it: although I agree with the background of the authors' idea, lack of access to cpr material and drugs in an OR environment is simply impossible (or should be). In contrast, remove the entire paragraph on the resuscitation of anaphylaxis, and insert it higher in the discussion, where it belongs more: preceding the paragraph that deals with the Japanese data.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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