

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
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

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><input type="checkbox"/> Innovative Approach: The study uses widely accessible technology (smartphones) to perform fundus photography, a typically specialized task, showing that smartphones can serve as practical tools for capturing retinal images without the need for additional equipment like adapters or sophisticated software.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Clinical Relevance: It highlights the importance of diagnosing optic disc and retinal afflictions early, especially in veterinary settings where specialized equipment may not always be available. The technique could improve clinical practices by making fundus imaging accessible for telemedicine, documentation, and education.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Detailed Methodology: The study provides a clear description of the materials used, such as 20D and 40D condensing lenses, along with step-by-step details of the procedure, ensuring reproducibility. The choice to use albino rabbits adds a layer of complexity due to the absence of melanin, making the fundus harder to visualize, which underscores the effectiveness of the smartphone-based approach.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Findings on Image Quality: The article notes that iOS devices produced better-quality images with superior resolution and field of view compared to the Android device used, providing insight into the technological differences between smartphones in clinical imaging.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>yes</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>Its comprehensive</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes its appropriate</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 study presents smartphone funduscopy as a feasible, inexpensive tool for ocular examination in veterinary patients, especially for albino rabbits. While iOS devices seem to outperform Android in image quality, both platforms offer significant promise for telemedicine, clinical documentation, and teaching purposes. The findings are promising, but broader studies with diverse smartphone models and more animals would strengthen the conclusions and help further validate the approach for clinical use.</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</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
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:	Raju S N
Department, University & Country	Spoothi Institute of Ayurveda And DR B S Savadi Ayurveda Hospital, Gangavathi, India