

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Immunology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 10399

Title: 'Resubmission of' Subcutaneous and sublingual immunotherapy: where do we stand?

Reviewer code: 02446789

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-03-31 15:12

Date reviewed: 2014-04-02 23:23

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript entitled "Subcutaneous and sublingual immunotherapy: where do we stand?" is interesting and of particular interest to authors and readers of allergic immunology. This is a well written manuscript with updates on recent studies in the field. I recommend that this manuscript should be accepted for the publication in the World Journal of Immunology.

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Immunology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 10399

Title: 'Resubmission of' Subcutaneous and sublingual immunotherapy: where do we stand?

Reviewer code: 02903408

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-03-31 15:12

Date reviewed: 2014-04-11 16:22

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Subcutaneous immunotherapy (SCIT) and sublingual immunotherapy (SLIT) are both effective treatments for allergic rhinitis and allergic asthma and both show clinical evidence of disease modification. The paper by Yukselen A reviewed the clinical effectiveness and safety of SCIT and SLIT in allergic respiratory diseases with amount of clinical studies and meta-analysis. The chosen topic is interesting and the manuscript per se state clearly and scientifically. Nevertheless there are a few questions need to be pointed out: 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. 2. Author listed several clinical trials information to compare the clinical effectiveness of SLIT and SCIT, but fewer author's conclusions in each section. 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. 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.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Immunology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 10399

Title: 'Resubmission of' Subcutaneous and sublingual immunotherapy: where do we stand?

Reviewer code: 02903408

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-03-31 15:12

Date reviewed: 2014-04-11 16:32

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Subcutaneous immunotherapy (SCIT) and sublingual immunotherapy (SLIT) are both effective treatments for allergic rhinitis and allergic asthma and both show clinical evidence of disease modification. The paper by Yukselen A reviewed the clinical effectiveness and safety of SCIT and SLIT in allergic respiratory diseases with amount of clinical studies and meta-analysis. The chosen topic is interesting and the manuscript per se state clearly and scientifically. Nevertheless there are a few questions need to be pointed out: 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. 2. Author listed several clinical trials information to compare the clinical effectiveness of SLIT and SCIT, but fewer author's conclusions in each section. 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. 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.