

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_122708
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF LOSARTAN EYE DROPS FOR THE TREATMENT OF CORNEAL HAZE SECONDARY TO PRK/ LASIK/ PTK/ CROSSLINK: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW
Type of the 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 is significant for the scientific community as it systematically reviews the effectiveness of losartan eye drops for treating corneal haze, a condition that can lead to substantial visual impairment after refractive surgeries like PRK and LASIK. By collating and analyzing recent studies, it provides valuable insights into a novel therapeutic approach that could improve patient outcomes. The manuscript contributes to the ongoing research on antifibrotic treatments in ophthalmology, offering a potential new application for a widely-used medication.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title, "Analysis of the Effectiveness of Losartan Eye Drops for the Treatment of Corneal Haze Secondary to PRK/LASIK/PTK/Crosslink: A Systematic Review," is clear and accurately reflects the content of the manuscript. However, a more concise alternative could be: "Systematic Review of Losartan Eye Drops in Managing Post-Surgical Corneal Haze."</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 is comprehensive, providing a clear overview of the study's objectives, methodology, and key findings. However, it could benefit from a brief mention of the specific patient population or animal models included in the studies to give readers a clearer context. Additionally, the abstract could briefly discuss the need for further research or limitations encountered.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The division into sections such as the introduction, methodology, results, and discussion allows for a logical flow of information. The detailed analysis and categorization of results into different discussion sessions further enhance the clarity and focus of the manuscript.</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><u>-The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, as it follows a rigorous methodology for data selection and analysis. The critical examination of existing studies and the careful synthesis of data provide a solid foundation for the conclusions drawn. The manuscript effectively bridges the gap between experimental research and potential clinical application, making it a valuable contribution to the field.</u></p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Ensure consistency in terminology throughout the manuscript, particularly in how the conditions and treatments are referred to.</p> <p>Language/English Quality: The language is generally clear and suitable for scholarly communication, but there are minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that could be improved for better readability. A thorough proofread would enhance the overall quality of the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Title Adjustment:</p> <p>The current title is suitable, but a more concise alternative could be: "Systematic Review of Losartan Eye Drops in Managing Post-Surgical Corneal Haze." This revised title maintains the essence of the study while making it more succinct and easier to read.</p> <p>Abstract Enhancement:</p> <p>The abstract is generally well-written but could benefit from a few adjustments. Consider adding a brief mention of the specific patient populations or animal models included in the reviewed studies. This will give the abstract more context and provide a clearer understanding of the study's scope. Additionally, a brief statement regarding the study's limitations or the need for further research could be included to offer a more balanced overview.</p> <p>Language and Grammar:</p> <p>While the manuscript is written in clear and comprehensible English, there are minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that need attention. A careful proofread focusing on sentence structure, punctuation, and clarity will help enhance the overall readability of the text. Consider revising some sentences for conciseness and fluency.</p> <p>Methodology Section:</p> <p>The methodology section is well-organized, but adding a flow diagram depicting the study selection process (e.g., PRISMA flow diagram) could improve clarity and help readers follow the study selection process more easily. This is particularly helpful in systematic reviews.</p> <p>Discussion Section:</p> <p>The discussion is thorough, but it could benefit from a more explicit comparison with previous studies or alternative treatments for corneal haze. This would provide a more comprehensive understanding of losartan's relative effectiveness and place the findings within a broader context.</p> <p>References:</p> <p>The references are current and relevant. However, consider adding more studies that discuss the long-term outcomes of losartan treatment, particularly in different ophthalmic conditions, if available. This would further strengthen the manuscript's foundation and relevance.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Piyush Jain
Department, University & Country	M.K.C.G College and Hospital, India