

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_126692
Title of the Manuscript:	The Relationship Between Eczema and Asthma Control in Atopic Versus Non-Atopic Asthma Patients
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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>
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.		See below
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		See below
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.		See below
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		See below
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.		See below
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		See below

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		See below
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<p>The title reflects the content of the study in general, but it could be simplified a little more. For example, a shorter and more direct title such as “The Relationship Between Eczema and Asthma Control Among Atopic and Non-Atopic Patients” could be used.</p> <p>Abstract: The abstract provides a good summary of the study’s purpose, methods, key findings and conclusions. However, instead of “in an area of the Bronx with a high prevalence of asthma”, a broader statement such as “in a high-risk population” could be considered.</p> <p>Some paragraphs in the introduction are too long and contain too much information. Especially in the sections on the impact of socioeconomic factors or the lack of information in the literature, short, clear sentences would be more understandable. For example, you could divide the paragraphs on socioeconomic factors into two.</p> <p>In the statistical analysis section, a brief explanation of why the tests used were chosen could be added. In particular, a brief explanation of the choice of t-tests and linear regression would show the reader that the analyses are consistent with the purpose of the study. Also, it could be stated how “p<0.05” is taken as a criterion for statistical significance.</p> <p>In the discussion section, more direct statements can be used in comparisons with the literature. For example, in the section where you address the shortcomings of the study, you can state more directly that “the study was limited by its observational design”. Also, giving specific suggestions for further studies (e.g. “similar analyses in other populations”) can strengthen the discussion.</p> <p>In the discussion section, utilizing this study comparing eosinophils and total IgE parameters of atopic and non-atopic asthma patients would be a great contribution to the study. Ozkul Saglam N, Ozkars MY, Altas U, Altas ZM. Evaluation of the predictive value of total IgE and absolute eosinophil levels on allergy test positivity. North Clin Istanbul 2023;10(5):602-608.</p>	<p>Thank you for your valuable feedback. We have incorporated and highlighted all requested revisions in the manuscript:</p> <p>Title: We have simplified the title to “The Relationship Between Eczema and Asthma Control Among Atopic and Non-Atopic Patients” for simplification/conciseness.</p> <p>Abstract: The phrase “in an area of the Bronx with a high prevalence of asthma” has been changed to “in a high-risk population” for broader applicability.</p> <p>Introduction: Long paragraphs in the introduction, especially ones discussing socioeconomic factors and gaps in the literature have been divided. Sentences have been shortened and clarified to improve readability.</p> <p>Statistical Analysis Section: We added a brief explanation for the selection of t-tests and linear regression to demonstrate the alignment of these methods with the study's objectives. We clarified the use of “p<0.05” as the criterion for statistical significance.</p> <p>Discussion: In the section discussing study limitations, we revised wording to be more direct, stating that “the study was limited by its observational design.” Additionally, we have provided more specific suggestions for future studies, incorporating wording such as “similar analyses in other populations”.</p> <p>Literature Comparison: We incorporated the study by Ozkul Saglam et al. (2023) on eosinophil and IgE parameters in atopic and non-atopic asthma patients into the discussion to provide additional context and comparative data on these biomarkers. This addition is highlighted in the manuscript as reference 26.</p>

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment (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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	No ethical issues in manuscript