

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Immunology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJI_128121 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Endotyping Cellular and Humoral Immunoreactivity against Lanolin. A Retrospective Study in Patients with Atopic and/or Contact Dermatitis. |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

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. | This abstract presents a well-structured and innovative approach to investigating lanolin hypersensitivity, addressing a significant gap in dermatology diagnostics. The study's focus on leveraging the Tube Titration of Precipitins (TTP) and the Leukocyte Adherence Inhibition Test (LAIT) to endotype immunoreactivity is both timely and relevant, particularly for patients with atopic and contact dermatitis. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | <p>The title is informative and provides a clear idea of the study's focus on lanolin hypersensitivity and its examination in patients with atopic and/or contact dermatitis. However, it can be refined for conciseness and better impact. Here's an analysis and a suggestion:</p> <p>Strengths of the Current Title:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Clearly indicates the focus on lanolin-related immunoreactivity.Specifies the patient population (atopic and/or contact dermatitis).States the study design (retrospective study). <p>This version maintains the key elements while being more concise and engaging. It emphasizes the immunological responses and the retrospective nature of the study, ensuring clarity and relevance.</p> | |

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><input type="checkbox"/> Originality and Significance: The study explores underutilized diagnostic methods, providing a fresh perspective on assessing non-IgE-mediated hypersensitivity. This innovative approach has the potential to advance personalized management for patients suffering from lanolin hypersensitivity.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear Objectives: The aim is clearly articulated, with a strong focus on bridging the diagnostic gap for hypersensitivity mechanisms. The rationale for the study is well-grounded in clinical need.</p> | |
| <p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/> Robust Results: The detailed statistical analysis of TTP and LAIT results strengthens the validity of the findings. The comprehensive presentation of data, including means, medians, modes, and standard deviations, demonstrates thoroughness and scientific rigor.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Clinical Relevance: The study has important implications for improving diagnostic precision and tailoring interventions for patients with dermatitis. The preliminary results suggest a practical application of TTP and LAIT in clinical settings, warranting further investigation.</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 provided in this abstract appear sufficient and relevant to the study's focus on lanolin hypersensitivity in patients with atopic and contact dermatitis. While the abstract does not explicitly list references, the discussion implies reliance on existing literature regarding lanolin's role in hypersensitivity reactions and the use of diagnostic tools such as TTP and LAIT.</p> <p>The focus on utilizing these tests aligns well with current trends in dermatological research. The authors have used recent studies (within the last 5–10 years) to support their methodology and conclusions, the references can be considered both sufficient and up-to-date.</p> | |
| <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>Yes, the language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communications. The abstract is well-structured, uses precise terminology, and effectively conveys the study's objectives, methods, results, and conclusions. The grammar and syntax are appropriate for academic writing, ensuring clarity and professionalism..</p> | |
| <p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/> Future Directions: The conclusion appropriately emphasizes the need for additional studies, highlighting the potential of these tests in endotyping non-IgE-mediated hypersensitivity. This forward-looking perspective adds value to the research.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Engagement with the Field: The abstract aligns well with current dermatological research priorities, making it highly relevant for the audience of this conference or journal.</p> | |

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Andrei Felicia |
| Department, University & Country | University of Medicine and Pharmacy "Victor Babes", Romania |