

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_79842
Title of the Manuscript:	ASTIGMATISM IN INFANTS: STUDY OF CHANGING VISUAL AXIS IN INFANTS AND CHILDREN.
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>On a general level, I would like to highlight the effort made by the authors to carry out this review. However, the scope of the Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International is to publish papers in all areas of pharmaceutical, this article is a review about astigmatism in children. Therefore, I believe that this article does not fit the scope of the journal, and although it is a very interesting topic, it would have a better place in other journals related to optometry.</p> <p>Regarding the format, the journal indicates that for review papers: "<i>these papers will include discussion of papers published and data acquired in a specific area. We advise a length of 5000-9000 words, (including 50-150 references plus 3-5 figures and/or tables)</i>". So this review seems to be insufficient in all aspects. Furthermore, the normal order of any manuscript is introduction, methodology, results, discussion and conclusions. And not the one followed by the authors of introduction, methods and materials, discussion, results and conclusion. The discussion can only be made once the results have been mentioned.</p> <p>Regarding references, the journal states that "<i>In the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets</i>", and not in parenthesis. In addition, the journal indicates a guide on how to cite documents in the bibliography section, which the authors have not followed. I strongly recommend checking all references both in the text and in the bibliography section and citing them well.</p> <p>Of 22 references, at least half are published in the 1956-1984 range. I think the bibliography should be more up to date.</p> <p>ABSTRACT</p> <p>1. What do the authors mean when they say that "<i>Astigmatism is the abnormality within the curvature of the attention?</i>" According to the American Optometry Association "<i>astigmatism is an irregularly shaped cornea or lens that prevents light from focusing properly on the retina [...] In this case, vision becomes out of focus at any distance</i>".</p> <p>2. I find the methodology section abstract and informal. The exact databases consulted should be included here, as well as the date on which the search was carried out.</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>1. In the first sentence the authors state that "<i>According to recent studies, astigmatism cases differ between infants and school-aged children (1)</i>"; and when I go to look at the reference section, I don't know which edition of the book it is. So I don't know if this statement is from recent studies or not. Is it the 23rd edition? Or an earlier one? It is not the only reference in which the year of publication is not indicated.</p>	

2. When Atkinson et al. are cited, reference 2 is given, but this reference refers to Gwiazda J et al. Please correct it.

3. The phrase "*If images are not focused on the retina or whether one of is focused on the retina and the other is not, the associated sphere that is myopia or hyperopia is calculated.*" is repeated twice.

4. I think there should be more references in the introduction section, in the whole section there are only 3 references.

5. The aim of the study should be placed at the end of the introduction paragraph. And not repeated in the 3rd and penultimate paragraph of the introduction.

6. The objective as stated by the authors is "*to look at the prevalence of against-the-rule, with the-rule, and oblique-axis astigmatism in children*". Nevertheless, in the entire introduction is there any mention of prevalence data.

METHOD AND MATERIAL (I recommend changing the name of the section to material and methods or methodology or methods).

1. *As this is a review article, this section should contain information about the inclusion/exclusion criteria of the articles, as well as the date the search was carried out, the sources of information consulted and the search strategy to be able to replicate it. The data collection protocol and who carried out the data extraction, among other things.*

DISCUSSION

1. As I have already mentioned, this section should come after the results and not before. It should compare the results obtained with what has already been published in the scientific literature.

2. When stating the following sentence "*Recently, Gwiazda and co-workers²⁵ have reported that infantile astigmatism may have long-term effects on visual acuity that persist even when the astigmatism is no longer present.*" I imagine that 25 refers to a reference. But in the references section there are only 22. If instead of wanting to put a 25, the authors wanted to refer to reference 2 "*Gwiazda J, Scheiman M, Mohindra I, Held R. Astigmatism in children: changes in axis and amount from birth to six years. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci. 1984 Jan;25(1):88-92*". I think it is incorrect to start the sentence with recently, considering that reference 2 is from 1984.

RESULTS AND CONCLUSION

1. Since this is a review article, a flowchart of records selection and categorization should appear. As well as a description of the studies that have been included.

2. The authors write sentences such as "*There are studies that co-relates astigmatism in infants with other associated refractive errors one such study is by Gwiazda and colleagues (13) which showed [...]*", "*we also discovered, as did Gwiazda et al.17, that [...]*". When only one reference to Gwiazda et al. appears in the reference section.

3. If the aim of this study was to find out the prevalence of against-the-rule, with the-rule, and

Review Form 1.6

	<p>oblique-axis astigmatism in children, I believe that the authors fail to meet their objective. At no point do they provide concrete and specific data on the prevalence of the different types of astigmatism.</p> <hr/> <p>Finally, it should be mentioned that, regarding astigmatism in children, there are different systematic reviews and meta-analyses that authors should consider for this review, as it would help them in the improvement of their article. Some examples of these are:</p> <p>A. Hashemi H, et al. (2017). Global and regional estimates of prevalence of refractive errors: Systematic review and meta-analysis. J Curr Ophthalmol;30(1):3-22. doi: 10.1016/j.joco.2017.08.009.</p> <p>In this study a very intuitive table appears with all the studies separated by type of refractive error and indicating the age of the population studied.</p> <p>B. Tang Y, et al. (2021). Prevalence and time trends of refractive error in Chinese children: A systematic review and meta-analysis. J Glob Health;11:08006. doi: 10.7189/jogh.11.08006.</p> <p>This study references articles such as Li et al. 2019 (Refractive Error in Chinese Preschool Children: The Shanghai Study), which assesses the prevalence of astigmatism in children aged 4-6 years. Or that of Wang et al. 2014 (Refractive error among urban preschool children in Xuzhou, China), in which the prevalence of different types of astigmatism is evaluated according to the child's months.</p> <p>Finally, it should be noted that the authors should also consider this study for discussion:</p> <p>C. Varghese, RM et al. (2009). Refractive Status at Birth: Its Relation to Newborn Physical Parameters at Birth and Gestational Age. PLoS One;4(2): e4469. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0004469.</p> <p>In all the references listed, although all refractive errors are studied, there are data concerning astigmatism.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Natalia Cantó Sancho
Department, University & Country	University of Alicante, Spain