

Review of: "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)"

Zia Ullah¹

¹ University of Lahore

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

1: Add some methodology, findings and novelty in abstract.

2: Figure 1 should be revised with proper justification and clarity.

3: It's better to add some more physical reasoning of each fig in the Results and Discussion section.

4: An updated and complete literature review should be conducted and should appear as part of the Introduction, while bearing in mind the work's relevance to this Journal and taking into account the scope and readership of the journal. The citations are too less and should be revised by including following papers;

(1)Effects of variable density on oscillatory flow around a non-conducting horizontal circular cylinder, (2)Periodic magnetohydrodynamic mixed convection flow along a cone embedded in a porous medium with variable surface temperature, (3) Analysis of the Physical Behavior of the Periodic Mixed-Convection Flow around a Nonconducting Horizontal Circular Cylinder Embedded in a Porous Medium, (4) MHD and Thermal Slip Effects on Viscous Fluid over Symmetrically Vertical Heated Plate in Porous Medium: Keller Box Analysis, (5) Temperature-Dependent Density and Magnetohydrodynamic Effects on Mixed Convective Heat Transfer along Magnetized Heated Plate in Thermally Stratified Medium Using Keller

Box Simulation (6) [Stabilization of Double Inverted Pendulum Systems Based on Hierarchical Sliding Mode Control Techniques](#)

5: Please add details of novelty at the end of the introduction section.

6: The originality of the paper needs to be stated clearly. It is of importance to have sufficient results to justify the novelty of a high-quality journal paper. The Introduction should make a compelling case for why the study is useful along with a clear statement of its novelty or originality by providing relevant information and providing answers to basic questions such as:

a. What is already known in the open literature?

- b. What is missing (i.e., research gaps)?
- c. What needs to be done, why and how?

7: What is the major area of application of this work? Should be added in the manuscript

8: State the motivation of the paper more clearly.

9: Is this a well-posed problem?

10: The validation of results for two parameters should be added for accuracy of results and add recent work for the improvement of literature;

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csite.2024.104001>, <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0213991>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csite.2024.104641>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rinp.2024.107810>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csite.2024.104681>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csite.2024.104562>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csite.2024.104592>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.padiff.2024.100808>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csite.2024.104812>, <https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/9618432>

11: Research gap analysis tables should be added in the revised version.

12: What is significance of Richardson number, Prandtl number and Reynolds number?

14: What are convergence criteria of given method?