

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_126577
Title of the Manuscript:	Managing High Anisometropia – The Blended Refractive surgery way.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	In a bid to optimize visual outcomes and perhaps to reduce reliance on corrective lenses in patients with significant anisometropia, this publication has the potential to investigate combined refractive surgery, a novel and transformative approach.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It adequately emphasize on the study's dedication on a certain surgical mode, which renders it educational and informative to target audience.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	A detailed outline of different groups to be mentioned clearly in the methodology section.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	A more background study is required, which will enhance the manuscript by offering context for the importance of the topic. Patient selection is a part which need to be mentioned specifically.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Clarifying the groups and the criteria applied to each group would enhance the methodology section and research's reproducibility. Manuscript may favor surgical options, but emphasizing the limitations of non-surgical methods, which could influence patients' choice away from non-surgical alternatives.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The study's foundation can be improved by including more sources.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript would benefit from a better balance between medical terminology and language accessible to non-medical readers. This adjustment will make the content clearer and more engaging for a broader audience.	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sankhajyoti Saha
Department, University & Country	NSHM Insitute of Health Science, India