

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Immunology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJI_126461
Title of the Manuscript:	Endotyping Cellular and Humoral Immunoreactivity against Tartrazine in Allergic Patients.  A Retrospective Study.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

[Review Form 3](#)

**PART 1:** Review Comments

<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>	This investigation has been implemented in order to validate the effectiveness of some lab-exams other than in-vivo provocation-tests, namely TTP and LAIT tests in detecting/inspecting of cellular and humoral immunoreactivities as to TARTRAZINE, and to distinguish/discern between them, in patients affected with Non-IgE-mediated hypersensitivities.	<b>Thank you very much for your appreciation.</b>
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>Ok.</b>	<b>Thank you very much for your appreciation.</b>
<b>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.</b>	<b>Ok.</b>	<b>Thank you very much for your appreciation.</b>
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	With minor modifications for simplification especially in "Introduction" section also, by dipping deep into future implications, it could effectively communicate the significance of outcomes.	<b>Thank you very much for your appreciation. We split several paragraphs in the introduction to simplify and clarify the reading. We introduced a new section at the end of the paper named: 7. FUTURE DIRECTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CLINICAL PRACTICE</b>
<b>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.</b>	It is a well-structured and scientific survey concerning Non-IgE-mediated allergic reaction as to TARTRAZINE, characterising the cohort studies and the relate methods that have been recruited, and can open new infomative/supportive windows through comprehending/interpreting the underlying pathomechanisms pertinent to any other hypersensitivity responses types.	<b>Thank you very much for your appreciation.</b>
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Ok.	<b>Thank you very much for your appreciation.</b>
<b><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</b>  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Ok.	<b>Thank you very much for your appreciation.</b>
<b><u>Optional/General</u> comments</b>	Some sentences are can be simplified. Overall, this study effectively demonstrates important outcomes in terms of allergology.  <b>SEE ATTACHMENT</b>	<b>Thank you very much for your appreciation. We included in the text the corrections highlighted in the attachment.</b>

[Review Form 3](#)

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	