

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 manuscript provides valuable insight into a relatively underexplored area of allergology—lanolin hypersensitivity and its diverse immunological mechanisms. The use of TTP and LAIT as potential tools for endotyping cellular and humoral responses is innovative, addressing a significant gap in diagnostic methodologies for non-IgE-mediated hypersensitivity. The study's focus on precision medicine aligns well with current trends in personalized healthcare. However, the retrospective nature and lack of controls are notable limitations that slightly undermine the robustness of the conclusions.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title reflects the core focus of the study but could be improved for clarity and impact. A suggested alternative: "Assessing Cellular and Humoral Immunoreactivity to Lanolin: A Retrospective Cohort Study in Atopic and Contact Dermatitis Patients."	
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 comprehensive but could benefit from improved clarity and specificity: Suggestions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Highlight the retrospective nature in the methods explicitly. - Provide more details on the key statistical results, such as the spread of LAIT and TTP values, which are currently only partially described. - Remove redundant statements like "our preliminary results support" and directly present conclusions. 	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears scientifically accurate, with detailed descriptions of the methodologies (TTP and LAIT) and their application to lanolin hypersensitivity. However, several methodological limitations are acknowledged: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The lack of prospective design and controls raises questions about bias. - The interpretation of immunological results (e.g., LAI and titration ranges) could be better substantiated with comparative data. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and include recent publications, particularly in immunological testing and allergen identification. Adding a comparative reference on diagnostic methodologies for contact dermatitis might strengthen the discussion.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is generally clear and suitable for scholarly communication but could benefit from minor editing for conciseness and improved flow. Specific areas to refine include: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Reducing verbosity in the introduction and discussion.- Simplifying complex sentences for readability.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript has a novel premise but would benefit from a prospective study design in future work to validate findings. Figures and charts should be more prominently integrated into the results section to enhance data interpretation. Emphasize the practical implications of findings in clinical practice, such as how TTP and LAIT might directly influence patient management strategies.	

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:	Kirolos Eskandar
Department, University & Country	Helwan University, Egypt