Review of: "[Review] Early Real World Evidence on the Relative SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine Effectiveness of Bivalent COVID-19 Booster Doses: a Narrative Review"

Mohamed Farouk Allam[1]

1 Ain Shams University

Early Real World Evidence on the Relative SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine Effectiveness of Bivalent COVID-19 Booster Doses: a Narrative Review

Title: Informative but long.

Abstract: Appropriate but needs to be more clear and informative. The abstract is not well structured/organized.

Keywords: Add more words like (total keywords should be$\geq$5); Review and Booster dose.

Teaser Key messages: Do not use abbreviations without previous explanation; VE.

Introduction: Appropriate and informative; but long.

Methods: Systematic Review versus Narrative Review?

This is a systematic review and a meta-analysis could have been conducted.

The authors say "Meta-analysis was not planned, due to expected high heterogeneity". The study should have been designed as a Meta-analysis and if heterogeneity was found thereafter a systematic review could have been presented.

Figure 1: Appropriate and Informative.

Results: A meta-analysis could have been conducted.

For example: COVID-associated illness. Pooling of VE of different studies was possible and easy.

The same could have been done for COVID-associated hospitalization and death.

Table 1: Appropriate and Informative.

Discussion: Not informative. More details/comments were needed on the results.

Conclusion: Appropriate and Informative; long.

References: Most of references are new and appropriate for the topic of this systematic review.