



ISSN NO. 2320-5407

ISSN(O): 2320-5407 | ISSN(P): 3107-4928

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-58103

Title: *Incidence and Severity of Postoperative Dry Eye Disease: A Comparative Study of Phacoemulsification versus Small Incision Cataract Surgery*

<b>Recommendation:</b>		Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
✓ Accept as it is .....	Originality			✓		
✓ Accept after minor revision.....	Techn. Quality			✓		
Accept after major revision .....	Clarity			✓		
Do not accept ( <i>Reasons below</i> ) .....	Significance	✓				

Reviewer Name: Dr S. K. Nath

### Detailed Reviewer's Report

#### Strength of the study:

- The study addresses an important postoperative ophthalmic complication
- A large sample size improves the reliability of the findings
- Comparative design allows meaningful evaluation of two surgical techniques
- Both subjective and objective assessment tools were used
- Results are presented clearly in a simple tabular format
- Discussion is supported with relevant published literature
- The conclusions are clinically useful and practical

#### Weakness of the study:

- Ethical clearance approval is not clearly mentioned
- Follow up period is limited to one month only
- No statistical significance values are reported for group comparisons
- Potential confounding factors were not fully adjusted
- Single center study limits wider applicability
- Minor grammatical and formatting corrections are needed
- Long term postoperative outcomes were not evaluated

#### Reviewers Comments:

The manuscript presents a clinically relevant comparison of postoperative dry eye disease following phacoemulsification and small incision cataract surgery. The topic is important because postoperative ocular surface changes directly influence patient satisfaction and visual recovery. The methodology is appropriate, and the inclusion of both subjective and objective assessment methods strengthens the study. The results are clearly presented and are easy to understand. However, the manuscript should clearly mention approval from the institutional ethics committee rather than relying only on the Declaration of Helsinki. Statistical details comparing the two groups should also be presented more completely. The language is generally clear, although a few grammatical and formatting errors require correction. The relatively short follow up period, lack of adjustment for important confounding variables, and single center design should be discussed in greater detail. Overall, the manuscript provides useful clinical information and is suitable for publication after minor revision.

#### Previously Published anywhere/Plagiarism check:

The manuscript appears to be an original research study, and no obvious evidence of previous publication or duplicate submission was identified during this review. No apparent signs of plagiarism were observed in the submitted version. A standard plagiarism similarity check is recommended before final acceptance to ensure originality and compliance with publication ethics.