

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR- 58315

Title: Current Concepts in Allergic Eye Diseases: Modern and Ayurvedic Perspectives and Management.

Recommendation:

Accept after minor revision

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

Reviewer's ID: Bilquees Hamza

Detailed Reviewer's Report

The review manuscript titled "**Current Concepts in Allergic Eye Diseases: Modern and Ayurvedic Perspectives and Management**" explores the pathophysiology, clinical classification, and therapeutic paradigms of Allergic Eye Diseases (AEDs) from both Western biomedical and classical Ayurvedic perspectives. Ocular allergies constitute a widespread global health issue, impacting an estimated 40% of the population and representing a primary driver of ocular morbidity. The text tracks how clinical presentations can range from mild, self-limiting seasonal irritation to severe, chronic ocular surface diseases that threaten visual acuity through corneal scarring and secondary structural modifications.

Key Contributions

- **Dual Perspectives on Pathogenesis:** A significant strength of this review is its dual approach to defining disease etiology. It balances Western immunological frameworks—such as IgE-mediated mast cell degranulation and Th2-driven hypersensitivity—with classical Ayurvedic concepts that attribute these conditions to the aggravation of *Kapha* and *Pitta* doshas due to dietary, seasonal, and environmental factors.
- **Rigorous Classification and Diagnostic Outlines:** The paper clearly outlines the subcategories of AEDs, including Seasonal Allergic Conjunctivitis (SAC), Perennial Allergic Conjunctivitis (PAC), Vernal Keratoconjunctivitis (VKC), Atopic Keratoconjunctivitis (AKC), and Giant Papillary Conjunctivitis (GPC). It also details corresponding objective diagnostic procedures like conjunctival scraping, tear film analysis, and skin prick testing.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- **Integrative Therapeutic Concept:** The manuscript establishes a valuable baseline for an integrative therapeutic approach, highlighting how modern rapid-acting symptom management (antihistamines, corticosteroids, immunomodulators) can be safely complemented by Ayurvedic systemic stabilization (*Nidana Parivarjana*, *Virechana*) and specialized ocular procedures (*Netra Kriya Kalpa*).

Recommendations for Improvement

1. Elaborating on the Methodology and Evaluation Criteria

While Section 2 outlines the narrative search strategy across PubMed, Google Scholar, and Scopus, it lacks rigorous structural transparency regarding data synthesis and evaluation criteria.

- **Correction:** The author should expand the methodology section to specify the exact date ranges for the electronic database searches and clarify the criteria used to determine the relevance of peer-reviewed articles. Additionally, when cross-referencing classical texts like the *Sushruta Samhita*, *Charaka Samhita*, and *Ashtanga Hridaya*, the author should explicitly state the methodology used to translate or correlate ancient sanskrit definitions of *Abhishyanda* variants with modern biomedical hypersensitivity classifications.

2. Deepening the Comparative Analysis of Local Ocular Procedures

In the Ayurvedic Management section, several critical *Netra Kriya Kalpa* procedures—such as *Aschyotana* (eye drops), *Seka/Parisheka* (ocular irrigation), and *Bidalaka* (eyelid application)—are introduced alongside their classical textual rationale. However, the manuscript does not discuss how these procedures compare directly with modern topical treatments.

- **Correction:** The author should include an analytical discussion comparing the physiological actions of these local therapies to Western approaches. For instance, the paper should analyze how the diluting and mechanical cleansing action of *Seka* (using *Yashtimadhu* decoction) compares to the allergen-diluting function of modern artificial tears, or how the anti-inflammatory properties of *Bidalaka* applications compare to topical mast cell stabilizers in reducing eyelid edema.

3. Reconciling Contradictions in the Research Scope and Safety Analysis

The manuscript exhibits a minor systemic contradiction regarding its conclusions on clinical evidence. The abstract and discussion emphasize that further well-designed clinical studies are required to validate the long-term safety and effectiveness of these integrative approaches. However, the paper lists specific

REVIEWER'S REPORT

botanical drugs (*Shirisha*, *Haridra*, *Amalaki*) under a table labeled "with anti-allergic properties" without detailing their specific clinical validation or safety profiles in human subjects.

- **Correction:** The author should clarify this section by adding a paragraph to the discussion that bridges this gap. This section should detail the current state of clinical evidence for these specific dravyas, highlighting where laboratory screening ends and human clinical trials are still needed to firmly establish evidence-based safety and efficacy parameters.

Editorial Recommendation

This review addresses a highly relevant topic in ophthalmology, offering a comprehensive, multi-systemic framework for managing allergic ocular surface diseases. The integration of traditional medicine paradigms with modern clinical diagnostics is well-conceived and highly educational for clinicians exploring integrative care models.

Therefore, I recommend this article for publication with **Minor Revision**, contingent upon the author expanding the search methodology details, deepening the comparative analysis between *Netra Kriya Kalpa* and Western topical formulations, and reconciling the calls for further clinical safety studies with the listed anti-allergic dravyas.