

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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	Importance of the Manuscript: This manuscript presents a valuable approach to managing high anisometropia using a blended refractive surgery method. By combining ICL and LVC treatments in contralateral eyes, the study explores an innovative solution to address anisometropia in patients who are unsuitable for single-type refractive surgery. This approach can potentially enhance patient satisfaction by improving vision at multiple distances and reducing dependence on corrective lenses. The findings contribute to expanding options for refractive surgeries in complex cases, making it relevant for the scientific and clinical ophthalmology communities.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title is not appropriate, a minor modification for clarity is suggested: o Suggested Title: Managing High Anisometropia with Blended Refractive Surgery: A Comparative Study on Patient Outcomes	
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.	The abstract provides a brief overview of the purpose, methods, and conclusions. However, a clearer breakdown of the methodology and inclusion of more specific data points from the results section would strengthen its completeness	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is organized with appropriate sections, including an introduction, methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion. However, enhancing the description of statistical methods used for analysis in the methods section, and the discussion section would improve clarity.	
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.	The manuscript appears scientifically sound and aligns with clinical findings related to anisometropia and blended refractive surgery. However, statistical validation of results (e.g., confidence intervals or p-values for all key findings) is recommended to increase robustness.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are relevant and recent, covering key studies related to refractive surgery and anisometropia. It would be beneficial to include additional recent references on quality of life outcomes following blended refractive surgery to support the study's claims on patient satisfaction.	
Minor REVISION comments	The manuscript has some grammatical and language issues that need revision for scholarly communication. Improving sentence structure and eliminating minor typographical errors would enhance readability.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Shajitha Thekke Veetil
Department, University & Country	Primary Health Care Corporation Doha, Qatar