

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	Systematic review without meta-analysis

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.	High myopia is common. It increases with increasing axial length. Changes in choroidal and retinal perfusion, reflected in changes in FAZ and vascular density, contribute to pathological myopia, which presents serious vision-threatening complications.	Yes, exactly !
Is the article title appropriate? (If not, please suggest an alternative title)	And yes	Yes, thank you !
Is the article summary comprehensive? Do you have any suggestions for adding (or deleting) any points in this section ? Please writeyoursuggestionshere .	It is comprehensive and well written.	Yes, gratitude!
Is the manuscript scientifically correct? Please writehere .	It is scientifically sound; however, it is advisable to increase reliability by following the SWiM guidelines protocol and conducting research according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA). A modified scoring scale based on the Newcastle–Ottawa Scale (NOS) for observational studies should have been employed for the assessment of the quality of the included studies. This systematic review should clearly define the inclusion criteria, following the PICO framework. Outcome measures should be categorized into primary and secondary outcomes.	It is certainly advisable, but it is not exclusive to follow the SWiM guidelines protocol to have only a systematic review, after all a meta-analysis was not performed. And the inclusion and exclusion criteria were clarified in the methodology section. Remember that this article is not a meta-analysis.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form.	PubMed- based literature is allowed, it is recommended to include references. The versioncurrentlimits the number of references .	Ok! New, more current references have been added.
Is the quality of the language/English of the article suitable for academic communications?	I found errors in abbreviations, but they can be corrected. The manuscript needs further editing to improve grammar and clarity.	Thank you, they have been corrected.
Optional /General Comments	This research is scientifically robust and focuses exclusively on the characteristics of the foveal avascular zone . Insufficient reporting in academic sources and PubMed makes meta-analysis difficult. Including additional retinal and perfusion markers would increase scientific rigor and promote debate.	Remember that this article is not a meta-analysis, but rather a systematic review. Furthermore, the proposal is exclusively to evaluate the avascular zone of the fovea in highly myopic patients, and not to score all of its possible markers.

Review form 3

PART 2:

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