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The manuscript give a good systemic review and meta-analysis of CNV diagnostic accuracy by OCTA. While, The diagnostic accuracy of OCTA for CNV, from the clinical aspect, it mainly depending on the size of CNV; the activity of the CNV; and the primary causes of CNV, and etc.

Firstly, The small and stable CNV, might have a higher diagnostic accuracy with OCTA. However, if the CNV accompany with huge hemorrhage or PED known as a subtype of Type I CNV, which is commonly seen in polypoid choroidal vasculopathy in Asian patients. The accuracy may be poor because poor optical transmission of hemorrhage. Authors should consider the different type of diseases. Different proportion of different diseases may influence sensitivity and specificity.

The previous reported OCTA accuracy of CNV was varies in nAMD patients, the Six publications providing information on the diagnostic accuracy (sensitivity, specificity or calculations of positive and negative predictive values) of OCTA in nAMD varies from about 65% to 100% in specificity and sensitivity.[1-4]

Secondly, the projected artifact affected false positive rate, and different machine varies with CNV diagnosis accuracy. How the authors avoid the bias caused by projected artifact?

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.
I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal