

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-58340

Title: *Sterilization and Infection Control in Ophthalmic Operation Theatres: A Narrative Review*

Recommendation:

- Accept as it is
 ✓ Accept after minor revision.....
 Accept after major revision
 Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

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

Reviewer Name: Dr S. K. Nath

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strength of the study:

- The review addresses an important topic related to patient safety in ophthalmic surgery
- Current international guidelines and recent literature have been incorporated
- The manuscript is well organized with a logical flow of information
- Practical recommendations for operation theatre practice are clearly presented
- Emerging technologies are discussed in a balanced manner
- The review has educational value for healthcare professionals
- References are relevant and comprehensive

Weakness of the study:

- The literature search methodology lacks detailed selection criteria
- Critical appraisal of included studies is limited
- Some sections are descriptive and repetitive
- Minor grammatical and typographical errors require correction
- The limitations of a narrative review should be stated more clearly
- More discussion of evidence quality would strengthen the review
- Figures or summary tables could improve readability

Reviewers Comments:

The manuscript provides a comprehensive narrative review of sterilization and infection control practices in ophthalmic operation theatres. The topic is highly relevant because infection prevention remains a key factor in ensuring patient safety and reducing postoperative complications. The review is well structured and covers important areas including instrument reprocessing, environmental control, prevention of endophthalmitis, operation theatre management, and recent technological advances. The literature is generally current and supported by established international guidelines. As this is a narrative review, institutional ethical clearance is generally not required; however, the authors should clearly mention that the review was conducted using published literature only. The manuscript is easy to read, although minor grammatical, typographical, and formatting corrections are needed to improve presentation. A more detailed description of the literature selection process and a clearer discussion of the limitations of the review would further strengthen the manuscript. Overall, the article is informative, clinically useful, and suitable for publication after minor revision.

Previously Published anywhere/Plagiarism check:

The manuscript appears to be an original narrative review prepared from published scientific literature and international guidelines. No obvious evidence of duplicate publication or copied material was identified during this review. However, the journal should conduct a routine plagiarism similarity check before publication to confirm originality and ensure compliance with publication ethics.