

**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

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript titled "Endotyping Cellular and Humoral Immunoreactivity against Allium Spices and Sulfite Preservatives in Allergic Patients" explores immunoreactivity in patients with suspected Non-IgE-mediated hypersensitivity to garlic, onion, and sulfite derivatives. The study effectively evaluates the potential of the Leukocyte Adherence Inhibition Test (LAIT) and Tube Titration of Precipitins (TTP) in discriminating between cellular and humoral immunoreactivity, yielding significant results particularly for sulfites. While the research provides valuable insights into immunoreactivity mechanisms, it is constrained by its retrospective nature, lack of controls, and limited protocol rigor. Moreover, the sample groups for the two tests were different, raising concerns about comparability.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>yes</p>	
<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>yes</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Although the study had 100 patients in each cohort, the sample size is still small for generalizing findings, especially considering the diversity of allergic conditions and individual variability in hypersensitivity reactions.            Absence of a pre-established research protocol and use of non-randomized cohorts weaken the methodological rigor. The study did not include control groups or negative controls, limiting its ability to establish causality or validate findings.            The study acknowledges the use of skin tests and other diagnostic methods only in patients with inconclusive or non-reactive results, which may have missed important information on IgE-mediated or other allergy mechanisms.            The mechanisms responsible for the observed leukocyte adherence inhibition were not explored. The study did not elucidate which specific immune pathways were implicated in the test results, leaving the underlying biology largely unexplored            While the study demonstrates significant differences in immunoreactivity to sulfites, the findings for garlic and onion are less conclusive, with many patients showing moderate or low levels of immunoreactivity, thus raising questions about the sensitivity and specificity of the tests used.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.            =</p>	<p>yes</p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The article would benefit from a thorough language edit focusing on simplifying complex sentences, improving punctuation, and ensuring technical terms are clearly explained. Additionally, addressing the flow of ideas and ensuring consistency in the academic tone would help meet the high standards of scholarly communication.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Explicitly state how patient consent was handled or if it was waived, and provide details on data anonymization.  Ensure that the limitations regarding lost-to-follow-up patients are transparently discussed, and outline how future studies will mitigate this.  Clarify if and how the potential for bias due to the physician's role was addressed.  Clearly indicate whether the LAIT and TTP methods are validated for clinical use or are experimental, ensuring patients were fully informed of the nature of these tests.	

### **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>Zahra Kannejad</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, Iran</b>