

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Immunology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJI_115657</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Contribution of Leukocyte Adherence Inhibition Test in the evaluation of Non-IgE mediated immunoreactivity against benzoic acid in allergic patients.</b>
Type of the Article	

**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><b>Compulsory REVISION comments</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, this manuscript is important for the scientific community as it addresses the need for improved diagnostic tools for identifying non-IgE-mediated hypersensitivity reactions, particularly in allergic patients. By evaluating the potential of the Leukocyte Adherence Inhibition Test (LAIT) to discriminate immunoreactivity against benzoic acid, the study offers evidence into a novel approach for diagnosing allergic conditions associated with food additives. The findings contribute to advancing precision medicine by potentially enhancing the understanding and management of non-IgE-mediated allergies, ultimately benefiting patients and healthcare providers alike.</p> <p>2. The title of the article, "Contribution of Leukocyte Adherence Inhibition Test in the evaluation of Non-IgE mediated immunoreactivity against benzoic acid in allergic patients," effectively captures the main focus of the study. However, it could be more concise and clearer.</p> <p>Alternative Title: Assessing Non-IgE-Mediated Immunoreactivity to Benzoic Acid Using the Leukocyte Adherence Inhibition Test: Implications for Allergic Patients.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article provides a clear overview of the study's aim, design, methodology, results, and conclusion. However, there are some areas where it could be more comprehensive:</p> <p>(I) Background Information: The abstract could benefit from providing some background information on the significance of non-IgE-mediated hypersensitivity reactions and the limitations of current diagnostic methods.</p> <p>(II) While the abstract mentions that 100 patients were included in the study, it could provide more details on the characteristics of the study population, such as age range and gender distribution.</p> <p>(III) The conclusion may be made better by including a succinct policy implications of the findings</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be appropriate and follow a logical flow, including sections such as Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusion, Consent, and Ethical Approvals. These sections cover essential aspects of a research article and provide a comprehensive overview of the study.</p> <p>However, one critical subsection that could enhance the manuscript is the "Limitations" section. This subsection would typically appear after the Results section and before the Discussion section or at the end of the discussion. It is important because it allows authors to acknowledge any limitations or constraints of the study, such as sample size limitations, potential biases, or methodological challenges. Addressing limitations helps to contextualize the findings and provides transparency to readers about the study's scope and potential implications.</p> <p>Therefore, while the manuscript's structure is generally appropriate, including a dedicated subsection on limitations would further strengthen the overall presentation of the research.</p> <p>5. Based on the information provided in the manuscript, the research appears to be scientifically sound. The study follows a well-defined methodology, including a retrospective</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p>chart review, ex vivo allergen challenge tests, and leukocyte adherence inhibition testing. The data analysis and interpretation seem appropriate, and the conclusions drawn are supported by the results presented.</p> <p>However, as with any scientific research, it's essential to consider potential limitations, such as sample size, selection bias, and the generalizability of findings. Additionally, without access to the full manuscript and data, it's challenging to assess the study's scientific correctness comprehensively.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient, including some recent publications.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article appear suitable for scholarly communication. However, a few minor spelling and grammatical errors are identified below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Spelling Error: "incidental" in the Results section should be "incidentally."</li> <li>2. Spelling Error: "incognito" in the Consent section should be "in cognito."</li> <li>3. Grammar Error: "Don't indicate which pathways" in the Discussion section should be "Does not indicate which pathways."</li> </ol> <p>These errors are minor and do not significantly impact the overall readability or comprehension of the manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Uduma, Victor Uduma</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Ebonyi State University, Alex Ekwueme Federal University Teaching Hospital, Nigeria</b></p>