

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

Diego Fernández Lázaro<sup>1</sup>

1 Universidad de Valladolid

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The manuscript was prepared very well. The introduction section justifies the purpose of the study. I congratulate the authors for the preparation of the manuscript

I would like to congratulate the authors for the structure of the manuscript and all the research carried out. It is highly publishable. However, there are some concerns, in part important, so the review articles need revision, see below.

### Introduction

indicate why vaccination is the best system for covid control.

### **Materials and Methods**

The methodology is perfectly described and carried out, but I suggest that you divide the methodology into several sections

### Results

- The results in the tables should be substantially improved and express immunogenicity data. I think there is too much text.
- Why isn't there a Spanish study? https://doi.org/10.3390/vaccines10081170

## **Discussion**

- · Include a limitations section.
- · what does this manuscript specifically contribute?

# Conclusion

• In the Conclusion section, state the most important outcome of your work. Do not simply summarize the points already made in the body — instead, interpret your findings at a higher level of abstraction. Show whether, or to what extent, you have succeeded in addressing the need stated in the Introduction (or objectives).

