



REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-56975

Title: A Study To Correlate Optical Coherence Tomography Parameters with Visual Acuity in patients with Diabetic Macular Edema

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revisionYES

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality			√	
Techn. Quality				√
Clarity				√
Significance		√		

Reviewer's ID: JPR-094

Detailed Reviewer's Report

****REVIEWER REPORT****

****1. Strengths****

****Relevant Clinical Topic:****

The study addresses an important ophthalmic condition—Diabetic Macular Edema—which is a major cause of visual impairment.

****Comprehensive Parameter Analysis:****

Inclusion of multiple OCT biomarkers (CFT, DRIL, EZ, HRF, etc.) provides a broader understanding compared to single-parameter studies.

****Prospective Study Design:****

A prospective observational approach over 3 years strengthens data reliability.

****Adequate Sample Size:****

Analysis of 150 eyes from 120 patients is reasonably sufficient for correlation analysis.

****Use of SD-OCT Technology:****

Application of Optical Coherence Tomography enhances diagnostic precision.

****2. Weaknesses****

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Major Issues

* **Low Novelty / Redundancy:**

* Similar correlations (especially DRIL and EZ with VA) are already well established in literature.

* The study does not clearly define what **new knowledge** it adds.

* **Statistical Limitations:**

* Use of only Pearson correlation is insufficient.

* No multivariate regression to control confounders (age, duration of diabetes, prior treatment).

* Inclusion of both eyes from some patients introduces ***intra-subject bias***.

* **Methodological Concerns:**

* Mixed inclusion of treated and untreated patients may affect outcomes.

* No subgroup analysis based on disease severity or treatment history.

Moderate Issues

* **Language and Grammar Errors:**

* Numerous grammatical mistakes and poor sentence construction.

* Reduces readability and scientific clarity.

* **Inconsistency in Data Reporting:**

* p-value discrepancy (e.g., $p=0.05$ vs $p=0.005$ for CFT).

* Typographical and formatting errors throughout.

* **Poor Presentation of Tables/Figures:**

* Tables are not properly formatted.

* Graph description incomplete.

Minor Issues

* **Keywords formatting inconsistent**

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- * Abbreviations not uniformly defined
- * Reference style inconsistent

3. Key Points

- * DRIL and Ellipsoid Zone disruption show strong correlation with visual acuity.
- * Hyperreflective foci in outer retinal layers indicate worse prognosis.
- * Central foveal thickness shows only modest correlation.
- * Some OCT parameters (NSRD, VR abnormalities) are not significantly correlated.

4. Significance

- * The study has **moderate clinical relevance** as it reinforces the role of OCT biomarkers in predicting visual outcomes.
- * However, due to **lack of novelty**, its contribution is mainly **confirmatory** rather than innovative.
- * Potential utility in:
 - * Clinical prognosis
 - * Treatment monitoring
 - * Guiding therapeutic decisions

5. Recommendation

MAJOR REVISION REQUIRED

Justification:

- * Significant methodological limitations
- * Lack of novelty
- * Poor language quality
- * Inadequate statistical analysis

Specific Recommendations for Authors

1. **Improve Novelty**

REVIEWER'S REPORT

* Clearly state unique contribution (e.g., Indian population, combined scoring system).

2. ****Enhance Statistical Analysis****

- * Add multivariate regression analysis
- * Adjust for confounding variables

3. ****Correct Methodology****

- * Analyze one eye per patient OR apply statistical correction
- * Perform subgroup analysis (treated vs untreated)

4. ****Language Editing****

- * Professional English editing required

5. ****Revise Tables & Figures****

- * Proper formatting and labeling
- * Include complete graphs

6. ****Clarify Results****

- * Resolve inconsistencies in p-values
- * Present confidence intervals

****Final Verdict****

****Decision: MAJOR REVISION****

Not suitable for acceptance in current form

****WHY MAJOR REVISION – JUSTIFICATION****

Overall Reason

The manuscript on Diabetic Macular Edema using Optical Coherence Tomography has ****methodological flaws, statistical limitations, poor language quality, and low novelty****, which significantly affect scientific validity.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

****ABSTRACT SECTION (Lines 7–26)****

****Line 7–9 (AIMS)****

* Aim is ****vague and poorly worded**** (“which OCT parameter correlates more with Vision”).

* **Lacks hypothesis or clinical relevance.**

****Line 10 (DESIGN)****

* “cross-sectional prospective” is ****conceptually inconsistent**** (cross-sectional ≠ prospective).

****Line 12–16 (METHODS)****

* **Overloaded sentence; poor readability.**

* **Abbreviations (VR, HRF, EZ) not properly standardized.**

****Line 17–18 (STATISTICS)****

* **Only Pearson correlation used → ****inadequate statistical approach****.**

* **No mention of confounder adjustment.**

****Line 19–23 (RESULTS)****

* **Missing ****confidence intervals****.**

* **p-values inconsistently formatted.**

* **“most commonly seen” vs “most correlated” not clearly differentiated statistically.**

****Line 24–26 (CONCLUSION)****

* **Overgeneralized conclusions not justified by analysis.**

* **Grammar errors (“correlated with Vision”).**

****INTRODUCTION (Lines 34–51)****

****Line 35–38****

* **Basic information; lacks ****critical literature synthesis****.**

REVIEWER'S REPORT

****Line 44–46****

* Claim “very few studies” is ****incorrect**** (many studies exist).

****Line 47–51****

* No clear ****research gap or novelty statement****.

* Objective is repetitive and not sharply defined.

**METHODS (Lines 53–101)**

****Line 54–55 (Study Design)****

* Design unclear: cross-sectional vs prospective contradiction persists.

****Line 55****

* Ethics approval mentioned but ****no approval number**** provided.

****Line 56–60 (Criteria)****

* Inclusion/exclusion criteria ****not precise enough**** (e.g., severity grading missing).

****Line 61–63****

* Patients with prior treatments included → ****major confounding bias**** not controlled.

****Line 63–64****

* VA conversion described but ****no standard protocol reference****.

****Line 69–73 (Imaging)****

* OCT protocol insufficiently detailed (no inter-observer variability, repeatability).

****Line 74–76****

* Classification of DME types not linked to analysis.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

****Line 77–96 (OCT Parameters)****

- * Definitions lack **validation references**.**
- * Grading system appears arbitrary.**

****Line 97–101 (Statistics)****

- * Only Pearson correlation used → **major methodological weakness**.**
- * No:**

- * Multivariate regression**
- * Adjustment for confounders**
- * Sample size calculation**

**RESULTS (Lines 104–141)**

****Line 105–108****

- * Descriptive stats acceptable but poorly written.**

****Line 110–112****

- * Inclusion of both eyes → **statistical independence violation (major flaw)**.**

****Line 113–116****

- * Prior treatments not analyzed → confounding not addressed.**

Correlation Results (Lines 119–138)

****Line 120–121 (CFT)****

- * $p=0.05$ borderline; interpretation exaggerated.**

****Line 122–124 (Cystoid spaces)****

- * Non-significant result but still interpreted → misleading.**

****Line 125–127 (DRIL)****

REVIEWER'S REPORT

*** Significant but no adjustment for confounders.**

****Line 128–130 (HRF)****

*** Small subgroup (17 eyes) → **statistical reliability questionable**.**

****Line 131–132 (NSRD)****

*** Properly reported non-significant.**

****Line 133–135 (EZ disruption)****

*** Strong correlation but **causation implied incorrectly**.**

****Line 136 (HRF–EZ association)****

*** No statistical test clearly described.**

****Line 137–138 (VR abnormalities)****

*** Non-significant but still discussed clinically.**

**DISCUSSION (Lines 144–177)**

****Line 145–148****

*** Contradiction: $p=0.05$ earlier vs $p=0.005$ here.**

****Line 149–152****

*** Mechanisms discussed without proper referencing depth.**

****Line 153–156 (DRIL)****

*** Repetition of results; limited interpretation.**

****Line 157–163 (EZ disruption)****

*** Overemphasis without novelty.**

****Line 164–171 (HRF)****

REVIEWER'S REPORT

* Literature cited but ****no critical comparison****.

****Line 172–176****

* Claims about “standard parameter” are ****overstated and unsupported****.

**CONCLUSION (Lines 180–184)**

* **Overgeneralization beyond study design.**

* **No mention of limitations.**

* **Grammar and clarity issues.**

**REFERENCES (Lines 190–234)**

* **Inconsistent formatting.**

* **Some references incomplete.**

* **Citation style not uniform.**

**TABLES & DATA PRESENTATION (Lines 237–306)**

* **Tables poorly formatted and difficult to interpret.**

* **No table numbering consistency.**

* **Graph incomplete (line 305–306 cut).**

* **No legends or statistical annotations.**

**FINAL JUSTIFICATION FOR MAJOR REVISION**

Major Scientific Issues

* **Inadequate statistical analysis (no multivariate adjustment)**

* **Inclusion of both eyes → bias**

* **Confounding factors not controlled**

* **Weak study design clarity**

Major Writing Issues

* **Poor grammar and readability**

* **Inconsistent data reporting**

REVIEWER'S REPORT

* Formatting errors

Conceptual Issues

* Low novelty (already well-established findings)

* Overinterpretation of results

****FINAL DECISION****

****RECOMMENDATION: MAJOR REVISION****

****Reason:****

The manuscript has a valid clinical objective but suffers from ****serious methodological, statistical, and presentation deficiencies****, requiring substantial revision before reconsideration.