Book Name:	[Medical Science: Trends and Innovations](#)
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_BPR_4221**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Penicillin Allergy Diagnostics by Specific IgE Study**
Type of the Article	**Book chapter**

<mark>**PART 1:**</mark> **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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	**The importance of penicillin allergy diagnostics through specific IgE studies lies in their ability to accurately identify true penicillin allergies, reducing the unnecessary labeling of patients as allergic. This is crucial, as overdiagnosis of penicillin allergy often leads to the use of broad-spectrum antibiotics, contributing to antimicrobial resistance and higher healthcare costs. Specific IgE testing provides a reliable and non-invasive approach to differentiate between allergic and non-allergic individuals, promoting the safe use of penicillin in clinical practice. Furthermore, such diagnostics enhance patient safety and optimize antibiotic stewardship, benefiting both individual patients and public health initiatives.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	**"Advancing Penicillin Allergy Diagnostics: The Role of Specific IgE Studies"**	
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.	**The abstract of the article provides a concise overview of the study, including its aims, study design, place and duration, methodology, results, and conclusion. However, there are areas where the abstract could be enhanced for better clarity and comprehensiveness. Below are my suggestions:** **1. Aims** **- The aim is clear but could be expanded to include the study's potential clinical implications, such as how this evaluation might guide allergy testing or improve diagnostic accuracy.** **2. Study Design** **- The study design is mentioned briefly, but adding a line to explain why a retrospective analysis was chosen and how it supports the study's objective could strengthen the rationale.** **3. Place and Duration of Study** **- This section is detailed but might benefit from emphasizing the relevance of the study population size (e.g., "This population size provides a substantial data pool for reliable insights into specific IgE analyses.").** **4. Methodology** **- The methodology could benefit from more detail about how the specific IgE tests were conducted. Were standardized methods or equipment used? What were the inclusion/exclusion criteria for selecting data from the registry?** **- Including why the cut-off limit of 0.8 kU/L was chosen for IgE positivity would provide context for this decision.** **5. Results**	

	- The results are presented clearly, but the abstract could explain the clinical relevance of the finding that penicillin forms do not share antigenic determinants. For instance, how does this impact cross-reactivity or clinical decision-making? - Breaking the results into two parts (one for the similarities and one for the number of positive IgE cases) might enhance readability. 6. Conclusion - The conclusion is precise but could be expanded to include practical recommendations. For instance, the abstract could specify what other steps, in addition to IgE testing, clinicians might take to confirm penicillin allergy. - Avoid using vague terms like "very rare" without quantitative context. For example, you could state: "Real IgE-mediated penicillin allergy is estimated to occur in less than X% of cases." - The statement regarding the oral amoxicillin test could be clarified. Is it unreliable due to sensitivity, specificity, or both? Providing a brief reason would enhance its utility. Overall Suggestions for Addition/Deletion - Addition: Briefly mention the significance of the findings in clinical practice (e.g., improved diagnostic precision, reduced unnecessary penicillin avoidance). - Addition A line about the limitations of the study, such as its retrospective nature or potential bias in data selection. - Deletion: No major deletions are necessary, but some repetitive or less essential details (e.g., specific years in the "Place and Duration" section) could be omitted for brevity if word count is a concern. Incorporating these changes would make the abstract more informative, clinically relevant, and reader-friendly.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the Penicillin Allergy Diagnostics by Specific IgE study is scientifically valid and plays a critical role in allergy diagnostics. This method measures specific IgE antibodies against penicillin and its metabolites, helping to confirm or rule out true IgE-mediated allergic reactions. Such diagnostics are essential because many patients with a reported penicillin allergy are not truly allergic, leading to unnecessary avoidance of penicillin-based antibiotics. By providing precise data, these tests improve patient safety, guide appropriate antibiotic use, and reduce the emergence of antibiotic resistance caused by alternative broad-spectrum antibiotics. Additionally, this approach supports personalized medicine by tailoring treatments to the patient's immunological profile.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	No, references are not enough for review a Book and more articles should be read and be sited in the book. Also, please use updated and recent papers in the literature review to give more sense to the reader. Please add the following references: Bioactive Graphene Quantum Dots Based Polymer Composite for Biomedical Applications; Recent Advances in Inflammatory Diagnosis with Graphene Quantum Dots Enhanced SERS Detection; Recent Advances in Multifunctional magnetic nano platform for Biomedical Applications: A mini review	

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	**Authors should carefully revise and corrected all the grammatical issues and follow the scientific norms in the whole manuscript.**	
Optional/General comments	**Authors need to read more relevant papers that are highly cited or published in high-quality journals and make more in-depth discussions or comments. Also, more figures and tables should be included in the article to achieve high quality, because the article lacks figures and there are not enough tables in the article.** The authors claimed that this book the Penicillin Allergy Diagnostics by Specific IgE Study. This book is well organized and written, but the following points in the article should be corrected for publication: 1) Authors should carefully revise and correct all the grammatical issues and follow the scientific norms in the whole manuscript. 2) Please use updated and recent papers in the literature review to give more sense to the reader. 3) Authors need to read more relevant papers that are highly cited or published in high-quality journals and make more in-depth discussions or comments. 4) Please, more figures and tables should be included in the article to achieve high quality, because the article lacks figures and there are not enough tables in the article. 5) The abstract of the article should be revised. 6) The conclusion is not fully and comprehensively explained, please correct it.	

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:	**Masoomeh Yari Kalashgrani**
Department, University & Country	**Biotechnology Research Center, Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, Iran**