

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Human papillomavirus and retinoblastoma: evidence from a systematic review and meta-analysis of cross-sectional studies

Review, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Marco Ramirez

Submitted on: 17 Oct 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2023.1605284

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main theme of the review.

Meta-analysis to determine the possible role of Human Papillomavirus infections in retinoblastoma samples

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Limitations: analysed studies were mostly cross-sectional with heterogeneity in inclusion criteria

Strengths: the first meta-analysis in this subject

Previously a review was published by Iranian author: Soltani S, Tabibzadeh A, Yousefi P, Zandi M, Zakeri A, Akhavan Rezayat S, Ramezani A, Esghaei M, Farahani A. HPV infections in retinoblastoma: a systematic review. J Clin Lab Anal. 2021 Oct;35(10):e23981. doi: 10.1002/jcla.23981. Epub 2021 Aug 30. PMID: 34462972; PMCID: PMC8529131

Q 3 Please provide your detailed review report to the authors, structured in major and minor comments.

Congratulation on this report. Information was presented in a clear and understandable way.
Data was neatly processed and organized and well structured in
Forest plots are nice displayed

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

Yes, reference list covers the relevant literature in unbiased manner

Q 5 Does this manuscript refer only to published data? (unpublished data is not allowed for Reviews)

Yes.

Q 6 Does the manuscript cover the issue in an objective and analytical manner

Yes.

Q 7 Was a review on the issue published in the past 12 months?

Yes.

Q 8 Does the review have international or global implications?

Yes, it has international implications

Q 9 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

I found the article very interesting and well structured written

Q 10 Are the keywords appropriate?

Keywords are appropriate

Q 11 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Article was written with excellent english

Q 12 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 13 Quality of generalization and summary



Q 14 Significance to the field



Q 15 Interest to a general audience



Q 16 Quality of the writing



REVISION LEVEL

Q 17 Please take a decision based on your comments:

Accept.