Qeios

Peer Review

Review of: "Vaccines, Revisited: The Case Against 'Natural Immunity'"

Andrea Trevisan[1]

1. University of Padua, Italy

I carefully read and considered the manuscript (commentary) "Vaccines, Revisited: The Case Against 'Natural Immunity'".

The text is well-written and well-researched.

Point by point.

Abstract: Comprehensive, accurately summarizes the text's findings.

Introduction: Accurately presents the state of the art on both "so-called" natural immunity and vaccine-acquired immunity. In particular, it focuses on the problem of biology during measles infection, a highly contagious disease with potentially serious, if not fatal, sequelae. Of particular interest was the mention of the effects, including temporal ones, of the disease: 1) mitochondrial alert, 2) proteostatic stress, and 3) neuroimmune response. Of further interest is the heading "vaccine fears," which "crumbles" the unfortunately not isolated negativist theories about vaccines (the vaccine/autism link), and the heading on mRNA vaccines, which is simple and, in my opinion, easily understandable even for non-experts.

Discussion and Conclusions are sound with the premises.

Allow me a personal digression.

Science is not an opinion (in my opinion, it doesn't exist in science), but rather relies on certain, repeatable data confirmed by experiments and epidemiological data. I agree with Dr. Rodgers's comments. This commentary should be read and absorbed by many supporters of "unusual" conspiracy theories, from flat-earthers to a sadly not insignificant group of people who view vaccines not as an essential preventive measure, but as a personal threat.

Ultimately, I have no comments or suggestions to make to the author of this commentary, which I consider exemplary.

doi.org/10.32388/UQ0X24

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.