

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

Hardik D. Desai¹

¹ Gujarat Adani Institute of Medical Sciences

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The authors have conducted a narrative review focusing on vasculitis following COVID-19. However, there are several reasons why this study may not be suitable for publication:

Title Misalignment: The title does not adequately reflect the nature of the study. It should be clarified that this is not a systematic review, as it lacks the necessary depth and breadth of articles to warrant such a designation.

Writing Quality: The article suffers from numerous grammatical errors and lacks richness and novelty in its drafting, which affects the overall readability and impact of the content.

Abstract Precision: While the abstract is the most concise part of the study, it primarily presents basic statistics about the number of articles and their gender distribution. Readers are interested in more detailed information, including the percentages of different clinical features and characteristics, as well as management strategies.

Inadequate Introduction: The introduction section is too small and lacks necessary elaboration. Additionally, it fails to provide a clear explanation of why this study was conducted and what gap in the existing literature it aimed to address.

Insufficient References: The article is missing key references that are essential for establishing the context and background of the research.

Inadequate Search Criteria: The search criteria employed were not described thoroughly, leaving readers uncertain about the comprehensiveness of the literature review.

Lack of Literature Gap: The study does not effectively identify or address a significant gap in the existing literature, and it fails to provide new insights or discoveries.

Weak Discussion: The discussion section is poorly written and lacks a coherent flow. It does not effectively synthesize the evidence presented.

Inconsistent Conclusion: The conclusion does not align with the evidence presented in the article, and the logical flow of the study is not apparent.

Suggested Submission: Given the above concerns, it may be more appropriate to submit this article as a letter to the editor rather than for publication as a review article.

In summary, while the authors have explored an interesting topic, several critical issues need to be addressed to improve the quality and suitability of the study for publication as a review article.