

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_130281
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF THE FOVEA AVASCULAR ZONE IN HIGHLY MYOPIC PATIENTS: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This offers a thorough examination of the alterations in the fovea avascular zone (FAZ) in people with high myopia, which is extremely important to the scientific community. This systematic review provides insights into the effects of myopia on retinal anatomy and visual function by combining results from several studies. Better care techniques for individuals with high myopia, particularly those who are susceptible to related problems such as maculopathy, can be achieved by having a better understanding of the FAZ in this population.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Clinically appropriate.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	It might be possible to define "therapeutic interventions" more precisely. For instance, elucidate if anti-VEGF medicines were used generally or only in situations with myopic maculopathy and other secondary effects. Although the databases (PubMed, Web of Science, and Google Scholar) are mentioned, it might be condensed for conciseness. For instance, "...obtained from major scientific databases..." unless the findings depend on the specific sources. Make sure that terms like "prevalence, characteristics, and clinical implications," if they are discussed in the text, are not used too often. Rather, incorporate them succinctly within the findings discussion.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	This academically sound systematic review examines the connection between high myopia and the foveal avascular zone (FAZ). The 92% sensitivity of OCTA and the FAZ expansion (0.05-0.07 mm ² per diopter) are highlighted, however sample sizes, inclusion criteria, and limitations are not covered. Clarifying the effects of anti-VEGF and using consistent nomenclature would improve rigour and guarantee wider clinical application.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The abstract's wording is understandable and typically appropriate for academic discourse. To improve clarity and professionalism, a few little changes are necessary, like using consistent terminology (FAZ vs. AFZ), stronger sentence construction, and more succinct wording.	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sankhajyoti Saha
Department, University & Country	NSHM Knowledge Campus, India