

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

Matteo Righini¹

¹ University of Bologna

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The aim of the study was to evaluate the effectiveness of bivalent COVID-19 two doses booster compared with a monovalent dose booster during a period when BA.5 and other Omicron sublineage viruses predominated globally.

The study was well conducted, the studies taking into account were reliable and of great importance in the context of vaccines response. There are several limitations of the study itself but are well described by the authors.

Considering such limitations it would be difficult to drive conclusions on vaccine effectiveness.

Some considerations on the study:

- The English language was excellent, there are just a few inaccuracies ("become" page 3, line 2; "on on " page 5, line 6; "from from" page 8, line 20)
- Abbreviations should be all explained the first time that appears on the text (ex. CDC, FDA)
- It's not clear which statistical analyses were performed to compare the studies. Even if meta-analyses wasn't performed due to heterogeneity, a better method's description is necessary.
- All the considered studies described vaccines situation of high income countries, so that they considered only a small sample that could not answer for all the variability. Adding data on low income countries would improve the quality of the study.
- The authors make considerations above age, but other demographic features (such as sex or race) weren't describe. I suggest at least to state that there were no differences considering those characteristics.
- First line of conclusion is not clear, please rephrase.

As correcting described by the authors, more studies have to be performed to develop vaccination plans for the foreseeable future.