

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Immunology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJI_125235
Title of the Manuscript:	Endotyping Cellular and Humoral Immunoreactivity against Allium spices and Sulfites preservatives in Allergic Patients. A Retrospective Study.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION 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>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	<b>The study investigates two different methods to assess non-IgE mediated Allergy towards allium spices and sulfites preservatives, namely the Tube Titration of Precipitins (TTP) and the Leukocyte Adherence Inhibition Test (LAIT). Whilst in general I find it a very important question and it would be of great importance to find a validated ex vivo test in order to avoid provocation tests I find it very difficult to follow on how the authors assess the value of these tests. Specifically, I do not understand how they correlate symptoms and reactivity of the tests. A control group is lacking and I do not understand how we can know how patients would react in these tests who do not have symptoms upon exposure to sulfites and allium spices.</b>	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>The title is suitable.</b>	
<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>	<b>The abstract is comprehensive even though I do not agree with the conclusion. I do not understand how we can use the test as a useful tool in diagnosing non-IgE mediated Allergy to allium spices and sulfite preservatives.</b>	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	<b>I suggest to shorten both introduction as well as discussion. Structure overall is fine.</b>	
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	<b>Unfortunately, I am not familiar with the two tests used in the article (the LAIT and the TTP, which seem to be tests routinely used in the clinic.) Unfortunately I therefore cannot say if the technical part of this trial is robust and would refer to reviewers more familiar with these kind of laboratory techniques.</b>	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> =	<b>Multiple very old references, possible shorten with a priority for recent publications.</b>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The English quality of the article is suitable.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Page 2: ...An experience done with regular volunteers....should rather state: ...an experiment done with.... Page 2: ... mainly in cooks who hand the spices...should rather state: ....mainly in coods who handle the spices... Page 2: .... LPT allergens....should rather state: LTP allergens	

### **PART 2:**

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

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Esther Helen Steveling-Klein</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University Hospital Basel, Switzerland</b>