



Paper: “Prevalence and Factors Associated with Food Allergen Sensitization Detected by Skin Prick Testing in Congolese Children with Atopic Dermatitis: A Cross-Sectional Study of 102 Patients at the North Kivu Provincial Hospital, 2025”

Submitted: 31 December 2025

Accepted: 20 March 2026

Published: 31 March 2026

Corresponding Author: Pascaline Ngolo Masudi

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n9p21

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Brunilda Myftari
University of Medicine, Tirana, Albania

Reviewer 2: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Brunilda MYFTARI	
University/Country: University of Medicine, Tirana, Albania	
Date Manuscript Received: 23.01.2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 31.01.2026
Manuscript Title: Prevalence and Associated Factors of Sensitization to Food Allergens in Congolese Children with Atopic Dermatitis	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0134/26	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: YES	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: YES	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: YES	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
The title is clear, informative, and consistent with the content of the manuscript. It appropriately reflects the study population, main variables, and geographical setting. The reviewer suggests that indicating the study design (e.g., cross-sectional study) could further improve precision, although this is not mandatory.	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	4
The abstract clearly presents the background, objectives, methodology, principal results and conclusions of the study. The main findings are relevant and well summarized. Minor language revisions are recommended to enhance clarity and to consistently emphasize that the study evaluates food allergen sensitization rather than confirmed food allergy.	

3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
The manuscript contains several grammatical and stylistic issues that affect readability. While the scientific content is understandable, careful language editing is recommended to improve sentence structure, spelling, and overall flow, in line with ESJ publication standards.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
The methodology is described in a generally clear and structured manner. Diagnostic criteria, severity assessment, and skin prick test procedures are appropriately detailed. However, additional clarification is encouraged regarding the sampling strategy, absence of sample size calculation, and the use of native food allergens. These aspects should be more explicitly discussed as study limitations.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
The results address the study objectives and present relevant findings. Nevertheless, some inconsistencies and ambiguities are observed in the tables, particularly concerning percentages and totals. A careful revision of all tables is advised. The exclusive use of univariate analysis should also be acknowledged as a limitation.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The conclusions are generally consistent with the results and provide a concise summary of the main findings. The interpretations are reasonable; however, they should be slightly moderated to reflect the cross-sectional design and the limited sample size.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
The references are relevant and adequately support the background and discussion. The inclusion of regional and international studies is appropriate. Minor adjustments to reference formatting and consistency are recommended to align with journal guidelines.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The manuscript explores an important and insufficiently documented topic, particularly in the context of sub-Saharan Africa. The study provides valuable local data on food allergen sensitization among children with atopic dermatitis and highlights culturally relevant dietary allergens.

To strengthen the manuscript, the authors are encouraged to carefully revise the language, correct inconsistencies in the results tables, and clearly differentiate between allergen sensitization and clinically confirmed food allergy. Expanding the discussion of methodological limitations, including sampling strategy and statistical analysis, will further enhance the scientific quality and clarity of the paper.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: