

Dear Editor,

I would thank you and reviewer for valuable contribution and recommendations. I made some revisions in the manuscript according to your recommendations. You can find the answers or comments related to questions of reviewer below.

Name of journal: *World Journal of Immunology*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 10399

Title: Subcutaneous and sublingual immunotherapy: Where do we stand?

Author: Ayfer Yukselen, Seval Guneser Kendirli

- **Reviewer comment 1:** There is no table of any kind in the whole manuscript, the organization of all clinical trials' information which author listed in the manuscript could be shown with tables.

Answer: Because the main aim of the manuscript is comparison of the studies with SCIT and SLIT, only one Table including information of head to head studies with SCIT and SLIT was organized. We suggested, a table displaying information of all clinical trials in the manuscript would overload the text.

- **Reviewer comment 2:** Author listed several clinical trials information to compare the clinical effectiveness of SLIT and SCIT, but fewer author's conclusions in each section.

Answer: According your recommendation, more comments were added to text. (see page 13).

- **Reviewer comment 3:** Most of clinical trials are randomized, systematic reviews. However, clinical outcomes are more concerned in each study instead of dosing, regimen, allergen modification and treatment cycles.

Answer: Although many valuable clinical trials were published in the literature about immunotherapy, we know that differences in study design, in protocols, in doses or sometimes in allergen extracts may reflect different results or decrease the power of the study. As is known, systematic analyses and meta-analyses are often conducted in effort to obtain a better understanding of how well these treatment modes work.

Actually, most of the studies discussed in the manuscript are meta-analysis or systematic analysis; because we suggested that such studies use a statistical approach to combine the results from multiple studies in an effort to increase power (over individual studies), improve estimates of the size of the effect and/or to resolve uncertainty when reports disagree. This approach would give more valuable information to readers.

- **Reviewer comment 4:** Author only mentioned a few paragraphs at very end of 'head-to head studies' about SLIT and SCIT suitable symptoms. At last part of this paper, 'future direction', a few novel safer and faster methods or administration routes have been mentioned, but without selection of indications. Paper should more focus on how to choose the different SIT methods based on the various allergic symptoms.

Answer: According your recommendation, a paragraph was added to final part of the text to explain the indications of different modes of immunotherapy (see page 14 and 15).

Kind regards,

Ayfer Yukselen, MD.