

Review form 3

Name of the journal :	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript number :	Mrs_JAMMR_130281
Manuscript Title :	EVALUATION OF THE FOVEA VARSUAL ZONE IN HIGHLY MYOPIC PATIENTS: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW
Article type	

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author Feedback(Please proofread the manuscript and highlight this part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that theauthorswriteyour feedback here)
Please write a few sentences about the importance of this manuscript to the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This provides a comprehensive examination of changes in the foveal avascular zone (FAZ) in people with high myopia, which is extremely important for the scientific community. This systematic review provides insights into the effects of myopia on retinal anatomy and visual function by combining results from multiple studies. Improved treatment techniques for individuals with high myopia, particularly those who are susceptible to related problems such as maculopathy, may be achieved through a better understanding of the FAZ in this population.	Yes. Exactly.
Is the article title appropriate? (If not, please suggest an alternative title)	Clinically appropriate.	Thanks !
Is the article summary comprehensive? Do you have any suggestions for adding (or deleting) any points in this section ? Please writeyoursuggestionshere .	It may be possible to define "therapeutic interventions" more precisely. For example, clarify whether anti-VEGF drugs were used generally or only in situations with myopic maculopathy and other side effects. Although databases (PubMed , Web of Science, and Google Scholar) are cited, they can be condensed for brevity. For example, "... obtained from large scientific databases ..." unless the findings rely on specific sources. Make sure that terms such as "prevalence, characteristics, and clinical implications," if discussed in the text, are not used too frequently. Instead, incorporate them succinctly into the discussion of the findings.	Defining therapeutic interventions in the abstract, where we need to summarize the general characteristics of the entire article, would not be the most recommended for this session. Furthermore, the limited number of words per article according to the journal's guidelines was reached, so this can be better observed throughout the reading of the article. I appreciate the suggestion of replacing the names of the databases with a generic term, it really made things easier. Thank you! The terms in this order were only used in the article's abstract ("prevalence, characteristics and clinical implications"). However, thank you for the advice.
Is the manuscript scientifically correct? Please writehere .	foveal avascular zone (FAZ). The 92% sensitivity of OCTA and the expansion of the FAZ (0.05–0.07 mm² per diopter) are highlighted, however, sample sizes, inclusion criteria, and limitations are not addressed. Clarifying the effects of anti-VEGF and using consistent nomenclature would improve rigor and ensure broader clinical application.	The sample size of each study can be found in the cited articles. The inclusion criteria and limitations are the same. It is worth remembering that the study did not aim to numerically suggest sample sizes for each study, but rather its most prominent findings, which are in line with our objectives. As Wang et al., 2022 makes it clear in the table that the effect of Anti VEGF is related to interventions with vascular endothelial growth factor inhibitors. As for the incorrect nomenclatures, these have been changed. Thank you!
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form.		Newer and more references have been added again.
Is the quality of the language/English of the article suitable for academic communications?	The wording of the abstract is understandable and typically appropriate for academic discourse. To improve clarity and professionalism, some minor changes are needed, such as using consistent terminology (FAZ vs. AFZ), stronger sentence construction, and more succinct wording.	Thanks for the suggestion, we've already modified it.
Optional /GeneralComments		

Review form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if you agree with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that the authors write your feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, please write the ethical issues in detail here)	