

Review of: "Retinal Vasculitis Following COVID-19 Infection: A Systematic Review"

Alyssa A. Grimshaw¹

¹ Yale University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The author presents a review of cases of retinal vasculitis after COVID-19 infection. The methodology used in this review does not meet the acceptable standard of a systematic review. I would recommend that the author change the review type to a rapid review.

1. The PRISMA flowchart and numbers related to the search are considered results and should be in the results section, not the methods.
 1. The PRISMA flowchart is filled out incorrectly. The first box in the right column is for duplicates and papers removed from other methods. The second box in the right column is for title/abstract screening exclusions, and the third is for papers the research team was unable to get the full text for, the fourth is for papers eliminated in full text. Only for papers in full-text review do you write a reason for exclusion. I recommend reading the Page et al. paper published in JMLA 2021, which discusses how to fill out the PRISMA flowchart.
2. The search strategy should be provided in the appendix, with the entire search strategy provided as entered into the search box, so other researchers can reproduce your work.
 1. If this is your full search strategy, please revise your search, as this is not exhaustive enough to be considered a systematic review. You need to include all synonyms for each of the terms you used in the review: (i.e., for covid-19, you should also be searching sars-cov-2 and coronavirus 2019, even if they are not the preferred terms now. You will also want to search any different word endings that could possibly be used too) I would recommend searching a second database, even another free database like Google Scholar, if you have no other databases available to you.
3. How was screening done? Were 2 screeners and an independent person available to resolve conflicts?
 1. A systematic review must have all studies screened by two independent screeners to reduce human bias and error. Without a second screener, this is not a systematic review.
4. Where is the risk of bias assessment? Details about data extraction? Did you register a protocol?
5. Please provide a limitations section in the discussion.
6. Please review the reporting guidelines PRISMA 2020 and SWiM (Synthesis Without Meta-Analysis) for detailed information about required reporting in systematic reviews. The Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews and the

JB1 Handbook would also be helpful to establish standard systematic review methodology.