

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_126714
Title of the Manuscript:	Visual Impacts of the Digital Environment
Type of the Article	Minireview Article

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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript holds significant value for the scientific community, particularly in ophthalmology and public health, as it explores the impact of prolonged digital screen exposure on eye health. The use of a well-structured and validated methodology to examine (CVS among medical students, looks to address the real-world implications of screen use on visual and retinal health. The focus on objective retinal function measures, such as mfERG assessments, provides valuable insights into the physiological effects of screen exposure on the retina, potentially informing both clinical and lifestyle recommendations.</p> <p>However, while the study design and methodology are robust, the manuscript requires significant improvement to meet its potential impact. Specifically, it reads more like an original research article or study protocol than a minireview. To strengthen this work, I would recommend presenting results that align with the outlined methodology. This includes reporting on the prevalence and severity of CVS symptoms, comparative retinal function differences, and how screen time correlates with retinal impacts. Expanding the discussion section to interpret these findings and its implications would greatly enhance the manuscript's contribution to the field.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Assessing Retinal Function Alterations Due to Digital Device Use: A Study of Computer Vision Syndrome in Medical Students</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract needs to capture the key result findings from the study.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>No. They are not as the study seem to be an original research study and not a minireview. Author(s) should include result, discussion, conclusion and recommendation sections</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically robust in terms of its methodology, as it follows a validated approach for diagnosing CVS and assessing retinal function using mfERG testing. This methodological rigor ensures that, if results were presented, they would likely provide reliable insights into the effects of screen exposure on eye health. However, the absence of results weakens the scientific value, as readers cannot assess the outcomes of this study or its practical implications. Additionally, presenting this work as a minireview rather than an original research article is misleading, as the methodology is suited to an empirical study rather than a review. For scientific soundness, the authors should present results and reframe the manuscript as an original research study to align with the methodology.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>Yes, they are. You also cite: Eni, CG, and Uahomo, PO. 2024. "The Effects of Excessive Use of Computer Screen on Visual Acuity Among Non-Academic University Staff". Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal 19 (5):63-76. https://doi.org/10.9734/or/2024/v19i5439</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is generally suitable for scholarly communication, though some improvements are needed.	
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:	Precious Uahomo
Department, University & Country	University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria