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

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**		
Optional/General comments	**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.** **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.** **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.** **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.** **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.** **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 Istanb 2023;10(5):602-608.**	

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Ugur Altas**
Department, University & Country	**University of Health Sciences, Turkey**