

### Review Form 3

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a> |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_JABB_125080   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Smartphone aided Funduscopy in Albino Rabbits                      |
| Type of the Article      | Short 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**

| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|---|--|---|
| <p><b>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.</b></p>                        | <p>This manuscript, "Smartphone Aided Funduscopy in Albino Rabbits," holds significant importance for the scientific community, particularly in the fields of veterinary ophthalmology and telemedicine. It highlights a practical and cost-effective alternative to conventional fundus cameras, making retinal examinations more accessible in various clinical settings. The use of smartphones offers an innovative solution, providing high-resolution imaging without the need for specialized adapters or software, making it feasible for both professionals and students. I appreciate this study for its potential to enhance the diagnosis and monitoring of ocular conditions in veterinary practice, promoting the use of readily available technology for improved patient care.</p>   |   |
| <p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>  | <p>The current title, "Smartphone Aided Funduscopy in Albino Rabbits," is concise but could be more specific regarding the study's focus and findings. A refined version that highlights the comparative nature and clinical relevance might be:<br/>           "Comparative Evaluation of Smartphone-Aided Funduscopy Using iOS and Android Devices in Albino Rabbits"<br/>           This version captures the comparative aspect of the study between iOS and Android devices and emphasizes its relevance to clinical fundus imaging in albino rabbits.</p>  |   |
| <p><b>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.</b></p>   | <p>The abstract is informative and includes essential aspects of the study, such as its aims, methodology, results, and conclusion. However, some points could be refined for better clarity and conciseness. Methodology: Avoid repetition and condense the explanation. The details about the use of auxiliary lenses and animal restraint could be summarized. Results Summary: The results section is clear, but mentioning specific findings like "mild edema and cupping" could be simplified while emphasizing the comparative performance between devices. Conclusion Refinement: The conclusion is well-stated but could be more direct about the significance of using smartphone funduscopy.</p>  |   |
| <p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>  | <p>The manuscript has a fairly organized structure, with the necessary sections and subsections.</p>   |   |
| <p><b>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.</b></p> | <p>This manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound for several reasons. Firstly, the study employs a well-defined cross-sectional design to compare smartphone-based fundus imaging in a controlled cohort of albino rabbits, which adds clarity and structure to the research. The methodology is detailed, covering the use of mydriatic solutions, the types of condensing lenses, and the specific smartphone models, which ensures reproducibility of the study. Additionally, the findings provide a clear comparison between iOS and Android devices, showcasing the strengths of each in terms of image quality, resolution, and field of view, supported by quantitative data. This thorough comparison offers a practical perspective on the use of smartphones for veterinary ophthalmology, highlighting their feasibility, ease of use, and potential for telemedicine.</p> |   |
| <p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>   | <p>The references in this list are generally relevant to the topic of using smartphone cameras for fundus imaging in veterinary and human ophthalmology.</p>   |   |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>   | <p>The language quality of the article is generally clear but could benefit from revisions to enhance readability, precision, and flow. Overall, while the article is suitable for scholarly communication, improving grammar, conciseness, and flow would strengthen its presentation and make it more engaging for readers.</p>  |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>   | <p>The manuscript provides a thorough evaluation of the use of smartphone cameras for fundus imaging in albino rabbits, comparing the effectiveness of iOS and Android devices.</p>  |   |

**Review Form 3**

**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>Allah Bux Kachiwal</b>                              |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Sindh Agriculture University Tandojam, Pakistan</b> |