

Peer Review

Review of: "Oral Polio Vaccine Is Unsafe for the World and Should Be Replaced with Inactivated Poliovirus Vaccine Globally"

Amit Raychoudhuri¹

1. Bharat Biotech (India), Hyderabad, India

John et al. have strongly advocated for the complete replacement of the oral polio vaccine with an inactivated polio vaccine in this manuscript.

The reduced benefit-risk balance of OPV in the EPI after the goal was changed from polio control to global polio eradication has been mentioned.

The authors have also mentioned the increasing cases of circulating vaccine-derived poliovirus (cVDPVs).

I have a few suggestions for the authors:

The authors can explain the benefits of IPV over OPV a little more elaborately. A study on the long-term immunogenicity of IPV in Italy can be cited (Larocca et al., 2022). The advantage of IPV in inducing better mucosal immunity following a booster dose, as found by Parker et al., 2015, can also be cited. The authors can also mention that though the introduction of the novel oral polio vaccine 2 (nOPV2) has indicated a reduction in the incidence of VDPV, studies are still not adequate, and the introduction of nOPV2 cannot eliminate the incidence of VDPV completely. The benefit of the fractional dose of Inactivated Poliovirus Vaccine (fIPV) in comparison to the full dose of IPV in terms of cost-effectiveness and to stretch limited vaccine supply can also be mentioned in the manuscript. The introduction of fIPV could make the replacement of OPV with IPV more feasible and could turn out to be an important strategy for polio eradication.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.