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AUTHORS
Manuscript_SYSR-D-19-00143
TITLE: Respiratory Syncytial Virus (RSV) prophylaxis for prevention of recurrent childhood wheezing: a protocol for a systematic review

This is an interesting study. It is well constructed and addresses a very important topic, producing valuable results. Outcomes are of interest and may help support the hypothesis of a causative association between RSV and recurrent wheeze and/or asthma and might suggest a novel path for prophylaxis on such an important disease.

I have minor concerns that should be addressed.

1. Would probably choose not to define RSV acronym on title but when first mentioned in abstract, and again in the main text.

2. The Background section of the abstract sounds a bit confusing. Mixes the association (causal?), with RSV-specific monoclonal antibodies and hospitalizations, with the preterm births and RSV infection. I would rewrite this section to provide a more direct and robust focus on i) RSV as causal (?) agent for asthma and ii) RSV-specific monoclonal antibodies as a way of preventing infection in preterm

3. Line 78: "ofbreath" both words seem merged.

4. From lines 77 to 81, all sentences are backed up by reference [1]?

5. Lines 90-91 authors highlight that it has been estimated that recurrent childhood wheeze represents 0.15% of the NHS expenditure, highlighting it as a key global health issue. Reference [7] dates back from 2003 (16 years ago), is there anything newer to update these values? Also, [7] determined the economic impact in the UK of wheezing disorders in preschool children hence I would geographically contextualize this and avoid stating "key global health issue"

6. Line 118 "profile, and and questions over" please delete "and"
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