

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 is highly significant for the scientific community, as it explores a modern approach to corneal and refractive surgery by integrating corneal collagen crosslinking (CXL) with refractive procedures. This combination represents a transformative shift aimed at improving corneal biomechanical stability while ensuring long-term refractive precision and visual acuity. By offering a detailed review of current evidence, protocols, outcomes, and potential complications, the manuscript serves as an essential resource for clinicians and researchers. Additionally, it underscores the potential to minimize complications such as iatrogenic ectasia and refractive regression, providing valuable insights into optimizing surgical techniques for patients with borderline corneal parameters or significant refractive errors. This review deepens the understanding of the evolving role of CXL in refractive surgery, paving the way for future advancements and refined clinical guidelines	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I recommend the following title: Integrating Corneal Collagen Crosslinking with Refractive Procedures: A comprehensive review.	
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.	I think it is informative, and well structured. No suggestions.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, it is correct.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The article cites 33 references, covering a wide range of studies, protocols, and case reports. The most recent studies cited are from 2020 , which is fairly recent but might not include the latest advancements or findings up to 2025. I recommend adding the following: 1) De Rosa, Giuseppe et al. "Combined photorefractive keratectomy and corneal collagen cross-linking for treatment	

Review Form 3

	of keratoconus: a 2-year follow-up study." <i>Therapeutic advances in ophthalmology</i> vol. 14 25158414221083362. 23 Mar. 2022, doi:10.1177/25158414221083362. And 2) Dal, Ali et al. "Effects and safety of combined corneal collagen crosslinking and intrastromal corneal ring segment treatment in patients with keratoconus: a retrospective study." <i>BMC ophthalmology</i> vol. 24,1 473. 30 Oct. 2024, doi:10.1186/s12886-024-03745-7. Both are recent and published in 2022, and 2024 respectively.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is suitable for scholarly communication and academic publication.	
Optional/General comments	I recommend adding visual aids, such as tables, charts, etc., for comparison, as well as adding more clarity.	

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:	Rania Zaid Ahmad Rawashdeh,
Department, University & Country	University Hospital Southampton, Jordan