



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Methodology*

**Manuscript NO:** 76205

**Title:** Reinfection, recontamination and revaccination for SARS-CoV-2

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 00724887

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Director

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** India

**Author's Country/Territory:** Hungary

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-03-07

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-03-12 13:33

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-03-14 10:44

**Review time:** 1 Day and 21 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Well written manuscript



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Methodology*

**Manuscript NO:** 76205

**Title:** Reinfection, recontamination and revaccination for SARS-CoV-2

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05455317

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Senior Scientist

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** India

**Author's Country/Territory:** Hungary

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-03-07

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-03-07 13:55

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-03-16 08:29

**Review time:** 8 Days and 18 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://www.wjgnet.com**

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The authors come up with an interesting perspective with a focus on "recontamination" taking the sidelines of reinfection after vaccinations. I have made subtle comments and edits in the manuscript. Generally the MS is written well, but has not so good citations. A pictorial perspective will be nice taking a coalesce of the three Rs. The conclusions must be elaborative. What is the inherent advantage of herd immunity may be described. Scores on a scale of 0-5 with 5 being the best. Language: 3 Novelty: 3 Scope/relevance: 4 brevity: 3