

Review report 2

The modified manuscript from Smith et al. is improved. A few minor points remain.

Why is Smith followed by a “?” in the author list?

p.1, next to the last line mentions 33.8 million episodes of RSV. Does this mean infections, or RSV disease that is severe enough to require medical attention? There is a 10-fold difference between these two possibilities.

The former. Clarification added.

Fig. 8 legend, 4 lines from the bottom “Vaccine-induced spikes”. Does the vaccine really cause this amount of disease? It sounds like the vaccine is spreading the virus. I don’t think that you mean that. Is there a better way to say this that does not lead to this false impression? Maybe “disease spikes in the vaccinated population.”

Done.

p.17, first blue paragraph: “...some (poorly understood) existing antibodies...” What do you mean by poorly understood? These are well understood antibodies. They come from the mother, cross the placenta by a receptor-mediated, specific transport mechanism for IgG only, and they represent the mother’s serum antibodies during the third trimester.

Delete?

The results in Fig. 6 suggest that a 75% vaccination rate would lead to eradication. Why not say that in the Abstract? But 50% vaccination could lead to spikes in virus infection (Fig. 7). Say that next.

Rewritten