

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Immunology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJI_122945</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Endotyping Cellular and Humoral Immunoreactivity against Aluminum in Allergic Patients. A Retrospective Study.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

## 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)
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.	This article is interesting because, using simple techniques such as TTP and LAIT, they have evaluated the potential of these tests to detect humoral and cellular immunoreactivity to aluminum, an element very present in our lives, in patients with allergic contact dermatitis, intrinsic atopic dermatitis and/or non-IgE-mediated urticaria. The aim is to develop cost-effective and efficient methods that have a socio-economic impact.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is appropriate.	
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.	The abstract is appropriate. I suggest that the following remarks be taken into account: 1.- In the background, where it says "these mechanisms", it should be specified which mechanisms? to make it clearer. 2.- Also use within the keywords "leukocyte adherence inhibition".	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	This manuscript complies with the guidelines for the organization of writings, but the following should be noted: 1.- The abstract exceeds the allowed 300 words. 2.- There are more keywords than allowed. 3.- The authors' contributions are not mentioned. 4.- The methodology does not describe the statistical analysis performed to obtain the graphs.	
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.	The manuscript complies appropriately with the guidelines for a scientific work. The background adequately describes and explains the significance of the project. The methodology adequately describes what was done and how it was done. However, the statistical analysis performed to create the graphs should be mentioned. The results are adequately described, as is the discussion.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are appropriate and sufficient, and more than 50% of the references are recent, from the years 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023 and 2024.	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language and the quality of the English allow an adequate reading of the manuscript, but it can still be improved.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	I suggest considering the following observations: 1.- For the key words, the authors must decide whether to use aluminum or aluminium, but not both. 2.- The guidelines state that there should be 4 to 8 keywords. Here 12 keywords are used. 3.- In the introduction, in the penultimate paragraph, you no longer describe what LAIT and TTP mean. This has already been described in the abstract. 4.- In Materials and Methods, section 2.1 Subjects, I suggest that the penultimate and antepenultimate but one paragraph belong together. 5.- In the Materials and Methods section, section 2.4 <i>In vitro</i> Investigation: Tube Titration of Precipitins (TTP), I suggest changing "one of us examined the tubes" to "the tubes were examined". 6.- Figure 1: Remove "Figure 1" from the diagram. The Y-axis should show "Number of tests/subjects", it should not be at the top. On the X-axis, "TTP" should be written below and in the centre of the dilution range. These observations must also be taken into account in Figure 2. 7.- In the second paragraph of the discussion, which is about "Personalized Medicine", medicine should be written in lower case.	

### **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>Fausto Rojas Durán</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidad Veracruzana, México</b>