

Review of: "[Review Article] Independent Analysis of the Results of the First Infant Immunization Campaign with Beyfortus® (Nirsevimab, Monoclonal Antibody Against RSV Bronchiolitis Virus): Mixed Results, Identification of Biases, and Possible Role and Mechanisms of ADE (Antibody Dependent Enhancement)"

Sanam Sadeghi-Mohammadi

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The manuscript appears to be well-structured and comprehensive. However, here are a few suggestions to improve the manuscript:

Grammar and Structure

- The grammar throughout the article is generally sound, but there are a few areas where sentence structure could be improved for clarity and readability. For example:
- “With the reservation of a large or unknown number of excluded treated subjects in both clinical trials and post-marketing observational studies...” could be more clearly phrased.
- “Given the high price of nirsevimab, the cost-effectiveness of mass immunization campaigns may therefore be debated from an economic and scientific point of view.” This sentence can be simplified for better impact.
- However, some sections could benefit from clearer subheadings to improve navigation. For instance, the discussion on the role of FcRn in Section 3 could be broken down into more specific subtopics for better organization.

Abstract

- The abstract does not clearly state the objectives of the review, which can make it difficult for readers to understand the focus of the article.
- There is no mention of the methods used to gather and analyze the information, which is a crucial component of a review article.
- The findings are presented in a somewhat disorganized manner, mixing effectiveness data with discussions on ADE and biases without clear separation.

Introduction

- The introduction should culminate in a clear thesis statement that sets the stage for the review. While it discusses various aspects of RSV and monoclonal antibodies, it does not provide a concise thesis that encapsulates the aim of the review article. The reader is left without a strong sense of the review's primary focus or unique angle.
- The introduction delves deeply into the background of RSV infections and vaccine development challenges, which, although relevant, may be too detailed for the introductory section. It could be more effective to provide a concise summary and then delve into specifics in later sections. This would help maintain the reader's focus and avoid overwhelming them with information early on.
- The introduction jumps between various topics without clear transitions or logical progression. This can make it difficult for readers to follow the narrative. For instance, the discussion on the challenges of vaccine development and the introduction of monoclonal antibodies could be better connected.

Methodology and Results

- The titles of the headings should be written concisely and clearly.
-
- The article could benefit from a more detailed explanation of the statistical methods used to analyze the results.
- Present data clearly, using tables and figures where appropriate.
- There is limited discussion on alternative explanations for the mixed results observed in the immunization campaign beyond ADE. Exploring other potential factors could provide a more balanced perspective.

Conclusion

- In the conclusion section, summarize the key points and discuss the implications and contributions to the field, and finally identify gaps and suggest future research directions.

References

- A few statements, particularly those related to the potential economic impact of nirsevimab and the detailed mechanisms of ADE, could benefit from additional citations to strengthen their credibility.
- Some sections rely on older studies where more recent research might provide updated insights.