

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Immunology
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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	This manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community as it addresses the challenge of diagnosing non-IgE-mediated hypersensitivity to hen's egg white, a common allergen with complex mechanisms. By evaluating the effectiveness of TTP and LAIT as diagnostic tools, the study provides valuable insights into cellular and humoral immunoreactivity. This proof-of-concept contributes to personalized medicine by identifying specific endotypes of allergic reactions, which can improve targeted treatments for patients. Moreover, its methodology has potential applications in reducing the reliance on invasive in vivo tests, enhancing patient safety and diagnostic precision.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	An alternative title could be: "Cellular and Humoral Immunoreactivity to Hen's Egg White: Insights from a Retrospective Allergy Study." This revision maintains the scientific clarity while emphasizing the study's contribution and scope.	

Review Form 3

<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive as it effectively summarizes the study's background, aim, methodology, key results, and conclusion. It clearly outlines the relevance of the Tube Titration of Precipitins (TTP) and Leukocyte Adherence Inhibition Test (LAIT) in assessing immunoreactivity against hen's egg white allergens in allergic patients. However, a few adjustments could enhance its clarity and focus:</p> <p>Suggested Additions: Clarification of Results Context: Include a brief mention of the clinical relevance of the findings (e.g., how the tests can reduce reliance on in vivo testing and improve patient outcomes). Details of Patient Cohorts: Add a concise note on the demographics or characteristics of the patient cohorts, as this is central to the retrospective analysis. Suggested Deletions: Reduction of Technical Jargon: Simplify some technical terms, such as "cascade distribution" and "semi-quantitative titration," for broader accessibility. These changes will make the abstract more engaging and relevant, especially for readers from diverse backgrounds.</p>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears scientifically correct, based on its presentation of data, adherence to structured methodology, and alignment with the stated objectives. Key elements, including the use of TTP and LAIT tests to evaluate cellular and humoral immunoreactivity, are well-explained with sufficient detail. Statistical analysis and clear definitions of patient cohorts support the validity of the findings.</p> <p>However, there are areas that may require closer scrutiny:</p> <p>Reproducibility: Ensure all experimental procedures are adequately detailed for replication, particularly regarding test conditions and preparation of hen's egg white extract.</p> <p>Limitations Acknowledgement: While the study acknowledges limitations, future work could more strongly address the lack of paired testing or a standardized protocol, which may impact generalizability.</p> <p>Consistency in Terminology: Some terms, such as "cascade distribution," might need clearer explanations for broader scientific comprehension.</p> <p>Overall, the scientific merit is robust and supports the hypotheses, making it suitable for further peer review with minor refinements.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references included in the manuscript appear comprehensive and sufficient for supporting the study's context, methodology, and findings. They cover relevant historical and recent literature, including studies on food allergens, laboratory diagnostic techniques, and immunological assays. Most citations seem recent and relevant to the field, with several from the past five years. However, a few suggestions for improvement could be considered:</p> <p>Suggestions: Update on Recent Literature: Include more recent references, particularly from 2023–2024, in areas such as advancements in non-IgE-mediated hypersensitivity diagnostics or personalized allergy medicine. Broader Context: Add references about the latest findings on the use of TTP and LAIT in other food allergies for a broader comparative analysis. These additions would ensure the manuscript reflects the latest developments in the field while solidifying its position within current scientific discussions.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article is mostly suitable for scholarly communication. It demonstrates appropriate use of formal and technical language, aligning well with the conventions of academic writing. The structure is coherent, and the key points are presented in a logical order, making the manuscript accessible to professionals in the field.</p> <p>Areas for Improvement:</p> <p>Simplification of Complex Sentences: Some sentences are overly complex and could be rewritten for improved readability. For example, phrases like "cascade distribution" or "semi-quantitative serum titration" might need more straightforward descriptions or contextual clarification.</p> <p>Proofreading for Minor Errors: While the English is generally strong, minor grammatical refinements could enhance the overall flow and precision.</p> <p>These adjustments will ensure the manuscript adheres to the highest standards of scholarly communication, enhancing its impact and readability.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is well-structured and explores a critical area of food allergy research, focusing on non-IgE-mediated hypersensitivity to hen's egg white. It provides a thorough methodology, supported by appropriate data analysis, and its findings contribute to the personalization of allergy diagnostics. However, a few points could further enhance the quality:</p> <p>Clinical Relevance: Highlight the potential clinical applications of TTP and LAIT in reducing invasive testing.</p> <p>Visual Data Presentation: Consider additional visual aids (e.g., detailed charts or tables) to make statistical results more accessible to readers.</p> <p>Language Refinements: Minor adjustments to sentence structure and technical terms could improve readability.</p> <p>Limitations: Acknowledge the retrospective design's limitations more explicitly and emphasize future steps to address them.</p> <p>These improvements will enhance the manuscript's impact and engagement with the target academic audience.</p> <p>Based on the provided information, the manuscript does not appear to have significant ethical issues. The authors have followed ethical protocols, including obtaining Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval and adhering to the Declaration of Helsinki principles for research involving human subjects. Consent was appropriately obtained from the institutional ethics committee for the retrospective study, and the authors explicitly declared compliance with international ethical standards.</p> <p>Considerations:</p> <p>Transparency in Ethical Declarations: The authors should ensure all ethical approvals and patient consent processes are thoroughly documented in the manuscript.</p> <p>Authorship Integrity: Verify that all contributors meet authorship criteria and that no individuals who made substantial contributions are excluded.</p> <p>Retrospective Design Bias: Since the study is retrospective, ethical concerns such as lack of direct patient consent may arise. Addressing this explicitly strengthens trustworthiness.</p> <p>Overall, the manuscript aligns well with ethical guidelines, and no major concerns are evident from the information provided.</p> <p>From the provided information, the manuscript does not seem to have any clear competing interest issues. The authors have stated ethical compliance, and there are no disclosed conflicts that would suggest bias due to financial, commercial, or personal relationships.</p>	

Review Form 3

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Reza Shekarriz-Foumani
Department, University & Country	Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, Iran