

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Immunology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJI_127742
Title of the Manuscript:	Endotyping Cellular and Humoral Immunoreactivity against Hen's Egg White. A Retrospective Study in Allergic Patients.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

**General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

**Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**PART 1: Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript highlighted the potential of the Tube Titration of Precipitins (TTP) and the Leukocyte Adherence Inhibition Test (LAIT) to identify immunoreactivity to hen's egg white proteins. The results of these tests were retrospectively collected from medical charts and displayed variable degrees of reactivity, linked to variable allergic phenotypes.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	To my mind, the title is not suitable because the authors did not correlate the results obtained with TTP and LAIT and each allergic phenotypes. So, the word "endotyping" should be removed. I suggest: "Cellular and humoral immunoreactivity against hen's egg white: relevance in allergic patients"	

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>	<p><b>The abstract is well-written and linked to the main topics of the manuscript.</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the manuscript scientifically correct? Please write here.</b></p>	<p>I have several major and minor remarks  Major points of the manuscript:  - the introduction is clear, introducing the topic of the manuscript and the issue addressed.  Major points to address:  1/ The manuscript indicates that 9,600 electronic charts were reviewed but only 2 cohorts of 100 patients were selected. Please discuss the criteria used to make the study cohorts.  2/ Please add some clinical data about patients, especially about clinical phenotypes (number of each, ...)  3/ Please add some laboratory data about patients, especially about egg white IgE values, to prove the non-IgE phenotype.  4/ Please add some information about how the diagnosis of the egg white-related non IgE-mediated allergic diseases were made, especially for urticaria, angioedema, rhinitis and bronchitis.  5/ Please discuss the fact that LAIT and TTP might have some variability results, owing to the fact that it is a operator-dependant count/read.  6/ The main limitation of the study is the fact that only patients with a diagnosis of egg white-related non-IgE mediated allergy were tested with LAIT and TTP. The lack of tests on subjects with no history of egg white allergy (= controls) made the confidence of the study very low. In other words, may people with regular consumption of egg white have positive results to LAIT and/or TTP?  7/ Because of missing clinical data, the study could not be considered as a proof-of-concept that LAIT and TTP can discriminate patients from "healthy people" but also patients with different phenotype.  8/ <i>"None of our patients presented an exclusive reaction to these allergens. Every patient was simultaneously evaluated for immunoreactivity against several chemical and biological allergens, demonstrating positive results for some of them. Our results suggest that some of our patients may impair their allergic symptoms by additional immunoreactivity against hen's egg albumen allergens."</i>  Please explain this part   Minor points to address:  1/ Please discuss why did you not use commercial extract of egg white?  2/ For LAIT and TTP procedures, please specify the number of people who counted the number of cells.  3/ If possible, change the type of Figure 1 and 2 to have a better schema of results.  4/ To my mind, the first 10 lines of the discussion is off-topic  5/ I'm surprised about the sentence related to laboratory tools to diagnose egg white allergy. The major allergy phenotypes to egg white are IgE-mediated, and determination of IgE to egg white and/or molecular components are very efficient.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is well-written.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> (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>
<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>Moise Michel</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>CHU Nimes, France</b></p>