

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_99957</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Scleral Buckling: Where we are, Choice from World over</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original article</b>

### **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> )

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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)</b>
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. The manuscript discusses the management of rhegmatogenous retinal detachment (RRD) and provides management guidelines for choosing a surgical method. RRD is a potentially blinding condition with a high prevalence, and the study addresses the current debate between two surgical options - scleral buckling and pars plana vitrectomy. The study also presents survey results from 109 retinal surgeons from 18 different countries, providing insights into current surgical practices. Overall, the manuscript is relevant to the scientific community as it presents current knowledge on the management of RRD and offers guidelines for surgical decision-making.</p> <p>2. The title of the article, "Scleral Buckling: Where we are, Choice from World over," is suitable for the manuscript.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive as it outlines the purpose of the study, provides a brief background on RRD, discusses the history of surgical options, highlights the current debate between scleral buckling and pars plana vitrectomy, and summarizes the survey results.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The manuscript is well-organized and follows a logical flow, starting with an introduction that provides background information on RRD and the history of surgical options, followed by a discussion of the current debate between scleral buckling and pars plana vitrectomy, survey results from retinal surgeons, and guidelines for surgical decision-making.</p> <p>5. Based on the information provided in the manuscript, it appears to be scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references provided in the manuscript are sufficient and recent. The authors have cited several clinical trials comparing the two methods, as well as recent publications on the evolution of vitrectomy machines and related instruments. However, additional references related to the latest techniques and technologies in the management of RRD, such as subretinal gene therapy, could be considered.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language is clear and understandable, and the authors effectively convey their research findings.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Hacène Frih</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Badji Mokhtar University, Algeria</b>