

[Review Form 3](#)

Book Name:	<a href="#">Science and Technology: Developments and Applications</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_BPR_4028</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Study of Diagnostic Accuracy: Fundus Photography vs. Optical Coherence Tomography</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Book chapter</b>

**PART 1: Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it addresses a need for improved diagnostic methods in the assessment of retinal abnormalities, which can lead to vision impairment and blindness. By comparing the diagnostic accuracy of non-mydratic fundus photography (FP) and optical coherence tomography (OCT), the study provides valuable insights into how these technologies can enhance the detection of retinal pathologies. The findings could potentially influence clinical practice and guidelines between primary and secondary care ophthalmology. This would allow for timely referrals and better patient outcomes. This research also contributes to the ongoing discussion regarding the role of optometrists in the healthcare system, emphasising their critical position in the early detection of ocular diseases.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title "Study of Diagnostic Accuracy: Fundus Photography vs. Optical Coherence Tomography" is suitable. It clearly indicates the focus of the research. An alternative title could be considered along the lines of - "Comparative Analysis of Diagnostic Accuracy in Retinal Imaging: Fundus Photography Versus Optical Coherence Tomography."	
<b>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.</b>	The abstract is comprehensive and well-structured. It covers the background, methods, results, and conclusions. One suggestion would be to include specific numeric results in the conclusion for clarity and impact, for example, "which provided gradable images in almost all examined eyes (XXX or 97.5%), compared to FP (XXX or 73.5%)"	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The manuscript is scientifically correct, adhering to the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki and employing a robust methodology to ensure reliable results.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> :	The references in the manuscript appear to be sufficient and mostly recent, covering a range of relevant studies and guidelines that support the research. However, to enhance the robustness of the literature review and to provide a more comprehensive background, the following additional references could be considered:  1. *Liu, Y., et al. (2021).* "Advancements in Optical Coherence Tomography: A Review." Journal of Ophthalmology, 2021. This article reviews recent advancements in OCT technology and its applications in retinal diseases.  2. *Zhang, X., et al. (2022).* "Comparative Effectiveness of Fundus Photography and Optical Coherence Tomography in Detecting Retinal Pathologies: A Systematic Review." Ophthalmic Epidemiology, 2022. This systematic review could provide additional insights into existing comparisons of FP and OCT.  3. *Kumar, S., et al. (2023).* "The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Optical Coherence Tomography: Enhancements in Retinal Diagnosis." Eye, 2023. This article discusses the integration of AI in OCT, which complements the manuscript's focus on diagnostic accuracy.	

[Review Form 3](#)

	<p>4. *Huang, D., et al. (2023).* "Optical Coherence Tomography: Technology, Applications, and Future Directions." Investigative Ophthalmology &amp; Visual Science, 2023. This review could provide a broader context for the implications of OCT technology.</p> <p>Including these references may help in providing a more comprehensive understanding of the advancements in both fundus photography and optical coherence tomography, strengthening the manuscript's foundation.</p>	
<p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communication. It is clear, concise, and free from significant grammatical errors.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is thorough and well-organized, addressing a critical area in ocular health. The authors may consider elaborating on the implications of their findings for clinical practice and future research directions.</p>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<p><b>Name:</b></p>	<p><b>Adam Alexander</b></p>
<p><b>Department, University &amp; Country</b></p>	<p><b>The Royal College of Ophthalmologists, London</b></p>