

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_96503
Title of the Manuscript:	A Novel Dual-wavelength, Dual-function Laser System for Presbyopia and Glaucoma Treatments
Type of the Article	

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.journalor.com/index.php/OR/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>1- It is a very interesting manuscript for the scientific community. The subject is quite innovative, but some details should be reviewed.</p> <p>2- Yes.</p> <p>3- Yes, but it would be important to finalize the conclusion. Details in the final comments.</p> <p>4- The structure must be reviewed. I believe the order of the description should be changed. More details in the final comments.</p> <p>5- Yes</p> <p>6- Yes. But references must be formatted and some are missing. Details in the final comments.</p> <p>Additional comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some important keywords: glaucoma, vitreous zonules, lens, ciliary body - What is in the introduction should be in the discussion: <p>“Review articles for the treatment of presbyopia, including the mechanisms, principles and various surgical systems, have been published [1-11], in which Lin [9-11] has recently proposed new laser systems for invasive presbyopia treatments using a single-wavelength IR diode laser. The present article further updates the future technology trend with a proposed novel strategy for improved accommodation using a dual-wavelength laser system. In addition, the action mechanism of accommodation based on the measured data will be further explored [13,14].</p> <p>Various technologies have been reported for presbyopia corrections include [7,10]; SEB (scleral expansion band), SRI (scleral radial incision by knife), SEP (silicon expansion plugs), BIC (band implanted in ciliary body), LPR (laser presbyopia reversal using scleral ablation), CK (conductive keratoplasty), DTK (diode laser thermal keratoplasty), LASIK (presbyopia LASIK using monovision), AIOL (accommodative IOL).”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Describe more about the pathologies in the introduction = concept - Repeat: “Fig. 1 shows the eye structure consists of [cornea, sclera (13), ciliary body and its apex, the anterior vitreal zonules (AVZ), posterior vitreal zonules (PVZ), the cross vitreal zonules (CVZ), lens and iris, where circumferential space (CLS) is the distance between the <u>ciliary ciliary</u> body apex and the lens equator.” - Should be in the discussion: “Analysis of measured accommodative gain” - Should be in the methodology: “Design specifications” - Conclusion is missing from the text. It was only in the abstract! <p>Conclusion: The more the muscle apex thickened, the more the lens thickened, and the lens equator tended to move forward (anteriorly) and internally away from the sclera toward the optical axis of the eye, so that the overall movement was antero-inwardly during accommodation. Thus, it is concluded that...</p> <p>Format the references (3,4,8,9,11,19,20 and 21 mainly)</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	YES	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kalinca da Silva Oliveira
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Health Sciences of Porto Alegre, Brazil