

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_99960
Title of the Manuscript:	Complications by ophthalmic residents while doing phacoemulsification surgery: A comparative approach
Type of the Article	Observation Study

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>See the attachment</p> <p>Not fully complied – See the attachment</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, Additional references are given here under:</p> <p>1. Complications in resident-performed phacoemulsification cataract surgery at New Jersey Medical School - https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/</p> <p>2. Complication rates of resident-performed cataract surgery: Impact of early introduction of cataract surgery training - https://pdf.sciencedirectassets.com/</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, Fairly good</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>At the outset, the article titled “Complications by ophthalmic residents while doing phacoemulsification surgery: A comparative approach” is an observation study with the available material.</p> <p>1. Aim and Objectives:</p> <p>The author has not mentioned the Aim and Objectives of the observation study. That means, the article is devoid of authors intention.</p> <p>Suggestion: The purpose of our study is to compare the rates of complications by Ophthalmic Residents ophthalmic residents while doing phacoemulsification surgery with supervision or without supervision of attending (Page No. 2 lines 26 to 28)</p> <p>2. Comments on the Abstract:</p> <p>a. “Institution Review Board Approval was obtained before the study was initiated. All Cataract Surgeries were done by third year and fourth year residents, total of 15 number were recorded.” This Paragraph to come under Sample And Sample Design (not mentioned).</p> <p>b. The author mentioned that approval for this study was obtained from Institution Review Board (Consent).</p> <p>Suggestion: However, this approval is not sufficient; because this approval is pertaining to “Permission granted to make an observation study in the Institute only.”</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Neither the author nor the institute authorities have not taken / obtained consent from the participants/patients</p> <p>Reason: In this study, the author is making use of the health records of the patients, that are their personal and cannot be disclosed even by the Institute Review Board/ Ethical Committee without the consent/permission (written) from the patient or any authorized person of the patient. This amounts to Criminal Trespassing on other's property namely Healthcare Records which are exclusive and belongs to the patients. Hence, the author cannot share the information of the patients pertaining to surgery without consent – consent from patients is required under Law.</p> <p>3. Disclosure Clause: It is mentioned in the article that, "all cataract surgeries were done by 3rd year and 4th year residents in two categories namely without any supervision and with supervision". In any healthcare facility, it is mandatory for the patient or the accomplice to know who is going to undertake the surgery his name, qualifications, experience etc (credentials); because the patient will have an option to agree or disagree with the Surgeon who is going to operate. However, in this case, no where it is mentioned that,</p> <p>a. The Cataract Surgery was conducted by 3rd year and 4th year residents under supervision of a senior surgeon who is well qualified,</p> <p>b. The Cataract Surgery was conducted by 3rd year and 4th year residents under without surgeon.</p> <p>This Act of not informing the patient or accomplice about the healthcare professional (surgeon) who is going to conduct the surgery to the patient amounts to professional unethics and liable for prosecution under Indian Laws.</p> <p>Because as mentioned above in the second category where the surgery is conducted by 3rd year and 4th year residents without supervision, if any complication arises (normally complications do occur in this surgery) who will held responsible because permitting 3rd year and 4th year residents is breach of conduct and law and in addition without supervision of a qualified person amounts to major degree of offence and it will attract vicarious liability (Indian laws).</p> <p>4. Circulation of Questionnaire to the Residents of Ophthalmology:</p> <p>When the results were deduced from the answers to the questionnaire by the residents, there is no cross verification which is important to know the authenticity of the information; because no resident Doctor who is in 3rd year or 4th year will divulge by himself/herself, the mistakes committed by them during the procedure and any complications that have been noticed during the procedure. Hence the information collected from the residents has lack of authenticity; if so the results derived there from will not be to the expectation.</p> <p>"The complications of phacoemulsification can occur at any stage during the procedure and can be done by novice to experienced surgeons. To avoid complications, it is necessary to have a supervisor by your side who can guide you and help you to avoid complication and manage complications if they occur [1]" (Page No. line 14 to 16)</p> <p>From the above statement of the author, it is clear that during this kind of procedure by novice to experienced complications ranging from minor to major do occur and a supervisor/guide is necessary to avoid complication and manage complication if they occur.</p> <p>However, in the sample the author mentioned that there are two categories one with supervisor and the other without supervisor.</p> <p>When it is confirmed factor regarding the necessity of having the procedure done with the supervisor to avoid or to manage complications during procedure if they arise, then the second category namely procedures without supervision of a qualified person amounts to "breach of trust" with the patient.</p>	
--	---	--

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Hence, in my opinion an I strongly fee that the second category procedure by the residents without supervision by a qualified supervisor cannot be considered because it show that “the patient is deprived of his/her legitimate right to have procedure conducted either by a fully qualified person or under the supervision of a qualified supervisor; because if any untoward incident happens/occurs and if the patient loses his sight partially or fully who will take the responsibility and how the patient will be compensated for the loss of vision and payment of compensation will be recourse to the incident?”</p> <p>The author also mentioned in the article,</p> <p>“The complicated links between trainee experience and problems have been the subject of numerous research, but little is known about how attending experience may affect resident surgical success” (Page No. 2 Lines 17 to 19)</p> <p>As mentioned by the author that “Little is known about how attending experience may affect resident surgical success; if so this kind of procedure (without supervision) can be conducted without the consent of the patient involved?”</p> <p>In such research procedures there is a universally recognized practice of calling volunteers who their services of their own accord and volley and who come forward on their own to this type of research work. The author has not mentioned any such procedure applied – which is not acceptable under medical ethics of research.</p> <p>5. Sample and Sampling methods:</p> <p>The author has not mentioned in results (page no. 3),</p> <p>“45 residents out of 50 residents (90%) performed phaco surgery without any complication under supervision”</p> <p>again,</p> <p>The author mentioned in page no. 4,</p> <p>“without supervision 30 residents out of 50 residents performed surgery without any complications”</p> <p>When the sample mentions that 50 residents were considered for this observation study how this above two statements correlate when total number is 50 only.</p> <p>6. Literature Study:</p> <p>The author has not mentioned about literature study which is important.</p> <p>7. Limitations of the Study:</p> <p>The author has not mentioned anything about the limitations of the study which is paramount in any article whether it is research article/review article/observation study.</p> <p>8. Future Study: Not mentioned</p> <p>9. Conclusion:</p> <p>The author mentioned in the conclusion that, procedures under supervision by the residents will have less chance of complications compared to procedure without supervision. It is obvious and general in nature any one can say so. On the other hand the author should explain the reasons for coming to that conclusion in an empirical manner from his observations.</p>	
--	---	--

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	C. L. Avadhani
Department, University & Country	Annamalai University, India