

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Immunology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJI_101073
Title of the Manuscript:	PAPULAR URTICARIA: Insights into non—IgE-mediated hypersensitivity reactions produced by stings of Culex spp and Aedes spp in patients with Intrinsic Atopic Dermatitis
Type of the Article	Review

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.journalaji.com/index.php/AJI/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>This work is a preliminary review, with a small n, however it contributes to medical diagnosis, using precipitin tests and/or leukocyte adhesion inhibition tests to determine if there is a relationship between papular urticaria and intrinsic atopic dermatitis, in patients suffering from non-IgE mediated hypersensitivity reactions produced by Culex spp and Aedes spp bites</p> <p>It's appropriate</p> <p>The abstract is very generalized, it lacks concrete data</p> <p>Acceptable</p> <p>The manuscript has some presentation flaws, for example the graphics</p> <p>Some references are recent, however 43 references is too few for a review</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Writing in the English language is adequate</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Abstract: Design, material and methods presented in a very general way Material and methods. Points 2.3, 2.4, 2.5 need a short description. 2.5 specify the number of patients Results: The authors state that they based their research on a retrospective review study of chart analysis, these should be well illustrated and explained. However, they fail in: The title of the Graph or figure 1 and 2 is missing, the Y axis lacks a title. In methodology they describe it as LAIT and in the graph as LAI. The results of the two graphs 1 and 2 deserve a better explanation. The results of the tests with precipitins can be summarized in a table</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:	Sara Rojas
Department, University & Country	Mexican Social Security Institute, Mexico