

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_121714
Title of the Manuscript:	Timing of vaccination in children after intravenous immunoglobulin therapy for Kawasaki disease
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

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 minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I found this paper of regional interest as the disease is quite rare being most frequently reported in Japan with an incidence of approximately 360 per 100.000 individuals. Lower rates have been reported in other geographic areas including Europe. The vaccination program is established by each and every country based on specific infectious pathology and peaks of incidence in according with continental scientific societies recommendations. Therefore, any conclusion of this paper cannot be regarded with same interest worldwide.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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 ambiguous with no high impact hints of the paper. For example, the phrase "based on the analysis of recent research findings both domestic and international, we propose that for Kawasaki disease (KD) children receiving IVIG treatment, the recommended vaccination interval for live attenuated vaccines" shows clearly that no strong conclusion can be drawn from the paper.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	I think the paper is intended to be a mini review but in this case the scientific data research should be more comprehensive. For example, there are not dates regarding epidemiology of the disease as it is a rare one and occasionally reported in other geographic areas but Asia. The vaccines are fairly presented but not with scientific dates from the literature regarding specific immune responses and efficiency in Kawasaki cases. Moreover, there are recent reports in the literature that suggest a possible link between Kawasaki disease onset and Sars-Cov-2 infection and/or vaccination. These facts should be interesting to discuss. The authors proposal of timing for vaccination of patients receiving IVIG treatment for Kawasaki disease has no scientific background and could be just speculative in respect with the scientific literature.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	I have found issues with the references. For example, reports mentioned in the phrase "Miron et al. reported the first case of KD after vaccination in 2003, and Nataliya et al. reported that a 3-year-old boy was diagnosed with KD after vaccination with polio vaccine in 2020" could not be found in the reference list.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bogdan Ioan Stefanescu
Department, University & Country	"Dunarea de Jos" University, Romania