

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_125243
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effect of Long-Term Computer Usage on Visual Acuity among Non-academic University Staff: A Cross-Sectional Study
Type of the 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)
<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>	This study the addresses the growing issue of Computer Vision Syndrome (CVS) due to prolonged computer usage, which is increasingly prevalent in today's digital age. The study focuses on a less-researched population—non-academic staff—adding valuable data to the body of research on how screen time affects visual acuity. I appreciate the manuscript's emphasis on public health awareness and the clear statistical correlations it provides between screen time and visual health.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The Impact of Prolonged Computer Use on Visual Acuity Among Non-Academic University Staff: A Cross-Sectional Analysis	
<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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The background clearly establishes the relevance of computer vision syndrome (CVS). However, it might benefit from briefly defining CVS or highlighting its common symptoms for readers unfamiliar with the term.</li> <li>2. The study's aim is well-stated.</li> <li>3. The methodology is generally well-described.</li> <li>4. The results section is informative, but adding a comparison between left and right eye visual acuity may offer more insight.</li> <li>5. The conclusion effectively summarizes the findings. However, adding a brief statement about the recommendations or practical applications of the study findings (e.g., workplace interventions or eye care policies) would make the abstract more impactful.</li> <li>6. No deletions are necessary; all sections provide valuable information.</li> </ol>	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	YES, all subsections and well-structured the manuscript appropriate.	
<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>This manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound for several reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Study Design: The use of a cross-sectional design with a large sample size (321 participants) ensures a comprehensive snapshot of the issue, making the findings more reliable.</li> <li>2. Random Sampling: The random selection of participants enhances the study's generalizability and reduces sampling bias, which strengthens the validity of the conclusions.</li> <li>3. Statistical Analysis: The use of appropriate statistical tools, such as descriptive statistics and chi-square tests, is methodologically sound and supports the identification of significant associations (e.g., screen time and reduced visual acuity).</li> <li>4. Objective Measurements: The use of the Snellen eye chart provides a standard and widely accepted measure for assessing visual acuity, ensuring that the results are based on established techniques.</li> </ol>	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	You Can Use My Study References Also Because I Also Did My Study On Effectiveness Of Sim On Knowledge Regarding Computer Vision Syndrome Among It Workers In 2018.	
Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	YES. IT'S APPROPRIATE	
Optional/General comments	It Should Be Generalize for The All Populations.	

#### 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)
<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>Kamlesh Menaria</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Geetanjali University, India</b>