

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_129719
Title of the Manuscript:	Simultaneous corneal collagen crosslinking with refractive procedures: A comprehensive review
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>

PART 1: 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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript reviews the most recent literature concerning the prophylactic use of CXL alongside refractive surgery. The aim of this procedure is to prevent high-risk corneas from developing ectasia. Such a review is significant for the scientific community, as by summarizing the latest studies, it may provide a broader perspective on this procedure.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Simultaneous Corneal Collagen Cross-Linking with Refractive Procedures: A Comprehensive Review I would suggest adding LASIK and PRK, as we are not discussing the SMILE procedure, for example.	
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.	The authors should include a Methods section detailing the literature search – which databases were used? Which studies were randomized controlled trials? Some data not mentioned in this article revealed that, despite producing similar outcomes in refractive status and keratometry, decreased postoperative CDVA at 12 months may indicate a higher-risk surgical profile for patients. Please include this data.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, but some additional articles need to be included, as per the comment above.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Please add the references as mentioned above.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language in the submitted article is clear.	T
Optional/General comments	This is a valuable manuscript that reviews the most recent literature regarding the prophylactic use of CXL with refractive surgery. However, some additional data need to be included before publication	

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:	Magdalena Kubrak-Kisza
Department, University & Country	United Kingdom