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Reviewer’s report:

This is an interesting case report of anaphylaxis-induced cardiovascular collapse requiring mechanical circulatory support.

My thoughts/comments:

1. I would avoid use of abbreviations in the abstract.

2. I suggest the authors ask a native English speaker to review/edit the manuscript as there are grammatical errors throughout the manuscript which make it difficult to read.

3. I suggest the authors use systematic approach (eg Airway, Breathing, Circulation..) when presenting their clinical findings.

4. Was vasoactive therapy guided by CO monitoring eg PAC studies, LiDCO etc? Was vasoactive therapy along with mechanical circ. support (IABP) optimal before decision to commence ECLS was made? ECMO cannulation is a high risk procedure...

5. More information about echocardiographic findings(LVEF, RV function, RWMA, TAPSE etc) prior to institution of ECMO is needed, if available.

6. The authors should specify the type of ECLS - presumably peripheral VA-ECMO?? Discussion about role of ECMO in refractory cardiogenic shock and outcomes should be expanded. VAECMO can be used as a bridge to recovery/transplant/bridge… and not in cases of reversible pathology only. This principle apples mainly to VVECMO and reversible respiratory pathology. Also, risks associated with peripheral VAECMO should be discussed.

7. How did the authors conclude that the patient discussed was in cardiogenic shock and not vasodialatory shock in context of anaphylaxis and/or toxin induced cardiomyopathy?

All in all admirable effort but the manuscript requires major revision in order to become a valuable addition to the scientific literature.

Many thanks
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