

Review Form2

Book Name:	Disease and Health Research: New Insights
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2394
Title of the Manuscript:	Navigating the Health Implications of Post-COVID-19 Vaccination: A Comprehensive Review
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This part is important for the scientific community because it presents an extensive evaluation of the health consequences from post-COVID-19 vaccination. In conjunction with historical and present studies, the part contributes unique knowledge about aspects of the immune system including cytokine storms and autoimmune phenomena. I commend this manuscript for its scope and clarity of communication that enables other medical practitioners or policymakers to understand complex topics easily. I would even encourage the authors to take their contribution one step further and propose discrete management plans for the populations affected to build on what advances future retroactive clinical practice.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title "Navigating the Health Implications of Post-COVID-19 Vaccination: A Comprehensive Review" is generally appropriate as it reflects the manuscript's focus on health-related effects of post-vaccination situations. The title could be thought of as kind of vague and too general. A more accurate title could be "Exploring Immune Responses and Long-Term Health Effects in Post-COVID-19 Vaccination." The proposed title emphasizes the aspects of the immune response specifically and then also the long-term implications that this manuscript covers. This will clarify the content and scope of the manuscript.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is fully developed and successfully summarizes the major points of the manuscript. The abstract addresses all of the major points that the review will address in the manuscript with the significance of the immune responses, cytokine storms, autoimmune manifestations, chronic inflammation, long COVID-19 syndrome, and mitigation strategies in the context of post-COVID-19 vaccination health and wellbeing. In summary, the abstract can benefit from improving the structure by adding some minimalist mention about the structure and organization of the part. For example, adding a sentence about the sections or flow of the review will fortify the communication of description and summarize, so readers' will have a better understanding of the larger overview.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The organization and structure of the manuscript are deficient and lack the rigor needed for a review. Although they made a good effort to organize, many of the sections are disconnected and provide no cohesive story. Transitions from one subsection to the next are also abrupt and do not lend themselves to a logical overview of the information. The paragraphs discussing each subsection do not provide much depth, allowing for the all too often critical information to be overlooked. For example, while the discussions on cytokine storms and autoimmune manifestations are important, the discussions can greatly benefit from providing more explanation and examples to elaborate on the complexities of each topic discussed. The manuscript does not adequately address things like variability in immune response in different populations. Given the various effects of COVID-19 based on demographics, this is a significant oversight. In summary, the layout of the manuscript lacking organization, clarity and depth. The authors need to give more structure to their information through subsections and improve transitions.	

Review Form2

Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript addresses a relevant and timely topic, but there are several areas where improvements could increase its impact. Although recent studies are cited, the analysis lacks sufficient depth, particularly in examining the complexities of immune responses to COVID-19 vaccination. This manuscript sometimes relies on sweeping generalizations that are not fully supported by evidence, which may reduce its credibility. Furthermore, the discussion of long-term symptoms of COVID-19 is somewhat simplistic and does not fully account for the diversity of patient experiences or the complex mechanisms that may contribute to these symptoms. Failure to consider demographic differences and pre-existing conditions further weakens the arguments, as these factors are critical to a comprehensive understanding of the impact of vaccination on health outcomes.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The references included in the manuscript are generally up-to-date and relevant, primarily focusing on studies from the past few years. However, there are certain areas where additional citations could enhance the depth and comprehensiveness of the review: Including more references that delve into the specific mechanisms behind long COVID-19 symptoms, particularly those related to immune dysregulation, would offer a more detailed exploration of this complex condition. Incorporating studies that examine the potential long-term effects of COVID-19 vaccination, beyond the immediate side effects, could help to better frame the manuscript's discussion on post-vaccination health implications. Adding comparative studies that directly analyze the side effect profiles and rare adverse events associated with different COVID-19 vaccine platforms would enrich the manuscript's analysis of vaccine-specific considerations. By integrating these additional references, the manuscript would provide a more thorough and current review of the scientific landscape regarding the health implications of post-COVID-19 vaccination, with an emphasis on immune responses and long-term outcomes.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally appropriate for scholarly communication, but several areas could benefit from improvement: Clarity and Precision: Some sentences are overly complex or awkwardly constructed, which may affect comprehension. For example, phrases like "the immune system employs both innate and adaptive mechanisms" could be simplified or rephrased for better readability. Grammar and Syntax: There are instances of grammatical errors and inconsistent verb tense usage throughout the manuscript. For instance, "the findings suggests" should be corrected to "the findings suggest." Such mistakes can detract from the professionalism that is expected in academic writing. Repetitive Language: Certain ideas are repeated in a way that feels redundant, which could be streamlined for conciseness. For example, the discussion surrounding long COVID-19 symptoms could be consolidated to avoid unnecessary repetition. Terminology Consistency: The manuscript occasionally uses different terms for the same concepts, which might confuse readers. Consistent terminology, especially when discussing complex scientific topics, is crucial for clarity	
Optional/General comments	You can improve its overall quality by considering a few general suggestions: Depth of Analysis: Manuscripts are valued for the topics they cover, but some sections require more. For example, long-term cases of COVID-19 can be enriched by carefully examining the underlying mechanisms and patterns of these symptoms across different populations. Review and precision: In some cases, the language of the text could be clearer and more precise. It is possible to simplify complex sentences and avoid specialized terms, it helps to read and reach the audience. Incorporation of new research: Although few are mentioned in this booklet, the most up-to-date research published in 2023-2024 may also be considered when developing views on booster vaccination. Evaluations: The manuscript should state its limitations more clearly, especially regarding individual differences in response to vaccination and possible factors of new virus types. Use visual aids: Adding visual aids such as analogies or tables summarizing key findings can enhance a section and make complex information manageable for readers. Strengthening Conclusions: Conclusions can be made more impactful by summarizing the main findings and their implications for research and clinical practice.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maghsoud Nabilpour
Department, University & Country	University of Mohaghegh Ardabili, Iran