

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Microbiology Research Journal International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_126160
Title of the Manuscript:	Post-vaccination alteration in meningococcus disease rate in the US from 1980-2019
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>Yes, it is important to the scientific community, but some corrections are needed in the manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>I think it's appropriate as a title.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The objective to study the impact of vaccination on meningococcal infection over a long time frame is clearly stated.</li> <li>- The manuscript uses publicly available CDC data, which lends credibility to the analysis.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>		
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The introduction section gives a thorough background of Neisseria meningitides and the epidemiology of the disease.</li> <li>- The methodology section is relatively sparse. There is no detailed explanation of how data was cleaned, analyzed, or any statistical methods used to assess trends. A more structured description of the analytical approach, such as trend analysis or statistical significance testing, should be added. It mentions the use of CDC's Health Data Finder but does not explain how the trend figures were derived from the raw data.</li> <li>- Figures and tables referenced (Figure 1, Figure 2, etc.) are not included in the document. These should be properly inserted or cited, as they are essential for understanding the trends discussed. Without these figures, it is hard to evaluate the conclusions drawn.</li> <li>- The comparison between different periods (e.g., 1980-2000 and 2001-2019) could benefit from more precise numeric data to substantiate the claims.</li> <li>- The manuscript acknowledges an increase in cases around 2008 but doesn't delve deep into potential reasons beyond the missing vaccine component (serogroup B). This section could explore other factors, such as public health policies or changes in reporting standards.</li> <li>- The rise in cases after vaccination introduction could be expanded. Were these due to vaccine coverage gaps, a delay in population immunity, or other demographic factors?</li> <li>- The conclusion is concise but too general. Expanding it to include implications for public health policy, future vaccine strategies, and how this data can influence current vaccination approaches would make the study more impactful.</li> </ul>	

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p> <p>-</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The introduction is overly reliant on references for basic information. While referencing is essential, certain common knowledge aspects (e.g., basic facts about Neisseria meningitides or common symptoms of meningitis) do not need extensive citation. This could be streamlined for clarity.</li> </ul>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Clarify Methodology:</b> Add details regarding the statistical analysis, handling of missing data, and potential biases in the data collection process.</li> <li>• <b>Data Visualization:</b> Ensure that all referenced figures and tables are included and clearly labeled. These visuals are critical for supporting the argument and understanding the study's findings.</li> <li>• <b>Enhance the Discussion:</b> Explore in more depth the factors that might explain the fluctuations in meningococcal infection rates, particularly the increase after 2008 and outbreaks despite vaccination.</li> <li>• <b>Update and Expand Conclusion:</b> Extend the conclusion to provide actionable recommendations for policy makers and vaccine developers. Consider discussing future prospects for meningococcal vaccines. With these refinements, the manuscript could present a stronger, more compelling narrative on the impact of vaccination on meningococcal infection trends in the United States.</li> </ul> <p><b>PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT</b></p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> (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)</p>
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Aqeel Ismael Ghani</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Koya University, Iraq</b></p>