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)"

Morteza Taghizadeh<sup>1</sup>

1 Razi Vaccine and Serum Research Institute

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

. I reviewed your paper titled "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)."

Language

\*

- The paper is written in a formal academic style

- Technical terms are used correctly and appropriately.
- Sentences are generally clear and informative.

\*\*Areas for Improvement:\*\*

- Some sentences are lengthy and complex, making them harder to read. Consider breaking them into shorter sentences for better clarity.

- There are minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasing in some sections. For example, "With the reservation of a large or unknown number of excluded treated subjects in both clinical trials and post-marketing observational studies nirsevimab has been shown to be highly effective in reducing hospitalization rates for RSV infections." This could be revised for clarity.

- Use of transition words could be improved to enhance the flow between paragraphs and sections.

## Coherence

- The paper follows a logical structure, with a clear introduction, body, and conclusion.

- Key points and arguments are presented in a sequential manner.

\*\*Areas for Improvement:\*\*

- The introduction section is very detailed and might benefit from a more concise summary of the key points.

- Ensure each paragraph focuses on a single idea or argument to maintain clarity.

- Some sections (e.g., the discussion of FcRn) delve into very detailed mechanisms which might interrupt the flow of the broader narrative. Ensure these detailed discussions are directly tied to the main argument.

- Highlighting more clearly what new insights or findings your analysis brings compared to existing literature could strengthen the novelty aspect.

- Emphasize any new hypotheses or potential areas for future research that stem from your findings.

- Ensure that all claims are well-supported by original data or robust references. Originality can also be demonstrated by critically evaluating existing studies and suggesting new frameworks for understanding the data.

- The overall structure of the paper (Abstract, Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusion) is appropriate for a scientific article.

- Use of headings and subheadings helps organize the content.

- The abstract could be more concise, summarizing the key findings and their implications more clearly.

- Ensure consistent formatting throughout the paper, including font, heading styles, and citation format.

### Specific Recommendations

1. \*\*Abstract:\*\*

- Revise for brevity and clarity. Summarize the key results and their implications more succinctly.

2. \*\*Introduction:\*\*

- Condense background information to focus on the most relevant points. Clearly state the research question and objectives at the end of the introduction. Summarize this section ,.

3. \*\*Methods:\*\*

- Ensure this section is detailed enough to allow reproducibility of your analysis. Include any statistical methods used.

4. \*\*Results:\*\*

- Present data clearly, using tables and figures where appropriate. Summarize key findings in the text.

5. \*\*Discussion:\*\*

- Interpret the results in the context of existing research. Discuss the limitations of your study and suggest areas for future research.

6. \*\*Conclusion:\*\*

- Provide a concise summary of your findings and their implications. Highlight the significance of your study.

## ### Final Thoughts

Your paper is a valuable contribution to the field of pediatric immunology and RSV research. With some revisions for clarity, coherence, and formatting, it will be well-suited for publication in a high-impact journal.