

Review Form2

Book Name:	Medicine and Medical Research: New Perspectives
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2312
Title of the Manuscript:	Wet and Dry Age-Related Macular Degeneration Induced by Polyethylene Glycol
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This review article offers a comprehensive synthesis of the current state of knowledge regarding polyethylene glycol (PEG)-induced models for studying age-related macular degeneration (AMD) and choroidal neovascularization (CNV). By summarizing various studies, it provides valuable insights into the utility and limitations of PEG models in replicating AMD pathology. The manuscript stands out for its clear discussion on how PEG models can replicate both dry and wet AMD features, making it a useful resource for researchers in the field. The integration of findings from multiple studies into a cohesive narrative is a significant strength of the review.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title accurately reflects the content of the review and effectively communicates the focus on PEG-induced models in AMD research. It clearly indicates that the review will address both the potential and limitations of these models.	
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.	The abstract provides a good overview of the review's content. However, it could be improved by summarizing the main conclusions drawn from the literature, including the key strengths and limitations of PEG models. Additionally, mentioning future research directions or unresolved questions could provide a more rounded summary.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's structure is well-organized, with clearly defined subsections that facilitate easy navigation through the review. Each section logically builds on the previous one, making the information accessible and coherent. To further enhance the review, consider adding a section dedicated to the limitations of PEG models and potential areas for improvement, which would provide a more balanced view.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript demonstrates a solid grasp of the scientific content and is technically sound. The review accurately summarizes and integrates findings from relevant studies, presenting a balanced view of the strengths and limitations of PEG models. The discussion is well-supported by references and provides a clear understanding of how PEG models contribute to AMD research. However, the addition of some recent studies could further strengthen the review's relevance.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references included are generally sufficient and cover key studies in the field. To ensure the review reflects the most current developments, consider incorporating a few more recent references from the past two years. This would help capture recent advancements in AMD research and enhance the manuscript's comprehensiveness.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and quality of English in the manuscript are appropriate for scholarly communication. The writing is clear and well-articulated, with an academic tone maintained throughout. Minor edits for clarity and conciseness could further improve readability.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is a valuable contribution to the field, providing a thorough review of PEG-induced AMD models. It effectively synthesizes existing literature and highlights the practical applications of these models. Future revisions could benefit from a deeper discussion on recent advancements and an expanded analysis of model limitations. The manuscript is well-written and informative. Minor revisions are suggested to enhance the completeness of the abstract, address recent developments in the field, and provide a more balanced discussion of model limitations.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Namira Putri Imani
Department, University & Country	Sebelas Maret University, Indonesia