

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_129072
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON OF THE DEFOCUS CURVE OF THE MOST USED PREMIUM INTRAOCULAR TRIFOCAL LENSES IN BRAZIL: A SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW
Type of the Article	SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW

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 provides a robust and methodical evaluation of the DeFocus curve variability in premium trifocal intraocular lenses (IOLs) commonly used in Brazil, emphasizing its clinical significance for visual correction and patient outcomes. By systematically comparing key trifocal lens designs, it elucidates critical factors such as light redistribution, neurovisual adaptation, and their roles in minimizing adverse effects like halos and glare. The study addresses a significant gap in the literature, offering evidence-based insights into optimizing lens selection and improving surgical outcomes. Its findings contribute valuable knowledge to ophthalmological research, guiding precision in patient-specific IOL implantation and advancing clinical practices in cataract and presbyopia treatment.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It can be refined for precision and readability like: "Comparative Analysis of DeFocus Curve Performance in Premium Trifocal Intraocular Lenses: Insights from Brazilian Clinical Practice"	

Review Form 3

<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>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clear Objectives: Explicitly state the research question or gap addressed. For example: "This study evaluates the clinical performance and variability of the DeFocus curve in premium trifocal intraocular lenses used in Brazil." 2. Methodology: Clarify inclusion/exclusion criteria and databases used. Mentioning the systematic review approach would add transparency. 3. Results: Include quantifiable outcomes, such as satisfaction rates or statistical metrics, to strengthen the findings. 4. Clinical Implications: Link findings to practice or patient care, highlighting how they guide lens selection or improve outcomes. 5. Conciseness: Streamline less significant details, focusing on broader findings. 	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically sound, with clear objectives focused on comparing the DeFocus curves, clinical effectiveness, side effects, and patient satisfaction of premium trifocal intraocular lenses (IOLs) in Brazil. The systematic review employs a comprehensive methodology with rigorous inclusion criteria and a robust dataset. Results are well-supported by evidence, and the discussion effectively integrates findings with clinical implications, emphasizing the importance of personalized IOL selection.</p> <p>Key Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear objectives and well-defined methodology. • Extensive review of relevant literature with robust findings. • Practical conclusions that guide clinical practice. <p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add visual data (e.g., graphs of DeFocus curves). • Expand on limitations regarding potential biases and regional differences. • Address minor grammatical and formatting inconsistencies. • 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references cited in the manuscript are sufficient and include a mix of recent and foundational studies, with many published within the last five years (e.g., 2019–2024). This ensures the inclusion of up-to-date findings relevant to the topic.</p> <p>Suggestions:</p> <p>If the authors wish to further strengthen the manuscript, they might consider including references on the latest advancements in neurovisual adaptation mechanisms or on comparative studies between trifocal and extended-depth-of-focus (EDOF) lenses in similar populations</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the manuscript is generally suitable for scholarly communication. The text is clear, precise, and demonstrates a good understanding of the subject matter. However, there are instances of minor grammatical errors, awkward phrasing, and repetitive expressions that could benefit from revision to enhance readability and flow.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript addresses an important and relevant topic in ophthalmology, providing a thorough systematic review of premium trifocal intraocular lenses (IOLs) and their clinical performance in Brazil. The comparison of DeFocus curves and patient outcomes adds significant value to the field, especially in guiding personalized IOL selection.</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive review of the literature with clear objectives. • Well-structured presentation of results, including key findings on variability, effectiveness, and patient satisfaction. • Practical conclusions that align with clinical applications. <p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Data Presentation: Consider including figures or graphs for the DeFocus curves to enhance visual comprehension of the findings. 2. Patient Factors: Expand the discussion on the influence of individual factors such as comorbidities or preoperative conditions on lens performance. 3. Future Directions: Highlight emerging technologies or unresolved challenges in trifocal IOL design to provide a forward-looking perspective. 	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Ankit S. Varshney</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Shree Bharatimaiya College of Optometry, Veer Narmad South Gujarat University, India</p>