

Review of: "A trabecular micro-bypass stent combined with phacoemulsification efficiently reduces intraocular pressure in open angle glaucoma in Mexican population"

Farshid Karimi¹

¹ Mashhad University of Medical Sciences

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Editor-in-Chief

I hope this message finds you well. I am writing to express my heartfelt gratitude for the opportunity to serve as a reviewer for your esteemed journal. It is truly an honor to contribute to the scholarly peer-review process.

Thank you once again for entrusting me with this responsibility. I look forward to collaborating with you and the editorial team in ensuring the quality and integrity of the research presented in your journal.

Best regards,

Farshid Karimi

Introduction:

1-The introduction is well-written. However, it might be better before the last paragraph, it is advisable to emphasize the use of new surgical techniques, sometimes combining two methods together, which can lead to a reduction in post-operative complications, and most importantly, significantly improved success in long-term patient IOP control.

Method:

1-In the "Method" section, in the first paragraph, the reference to Hodapp criteria should be included. This will provide the reader with more confidence in your study by allowing them to refer to the criteria for patient inclusion.

2-While the inclusion criteria of patients with cataracts in the study criteria are mentioned in the criteria for patient inclusion, there is no mention in the introduction of the prevalence and epidemiology of this condition worldwide and in the studied region. Therefore, this information should be added in the introduction.

3-In the exclusion criteria for patients, it should be stated that any patients experiencing post-operative complications at any stage were removed from the study.

4-Considering that the age of your patients is quite high, please specify whether these individuals had any systemic diseases. Did they have conditions like high blood pressure, diabetes, etc.?

5- The section on "Clinical evaluation" requires a thorough revision. It should begin by specifying whether the evaluations were performed by which optometrist or ophthalmologist. For example, "All optometric assessments, including visual acuity tests assessed using Snellen charts, refractive error of the patient, and evaluation of the patient's best visual acuity, were carried out by the optometrist (G, K) who had the necessary expertise in evaluating these patients. Referral to the glaucoma specialist (K, D) for necessary tests was made, and the required tests were conducted."

6-Were the individuals who conducted the patient evaluations consistent throughout or did they vary at different times? Did these individuals have awareness regarding your study?

7-In each evaluation, was IOP measured only once? It is recommended to assess IOP three times using the Goldman tonometer, and report the average to minimize measurement errors.

8-It is worth noting that you should specify the brand and country of origin of the devices used in the study in the first place of the article that is mentioned.

9-The order of conducting these tests needs to be carefully examined to ensure that patient assessments were carried out accurately. Therefore, a complete review and adjustment of all these elements is necessary.

10-In the "Ethical approval declarations" section, the ethics code should be mentioned.

11-The "Data analysis" section is mentioned very briefly. Was a statistician consulted for the statistical analysis? This section needs to be more detailed.

Results

1-In the "Results" section, unfortunately, it is inadequately written. In the clinical evaluation section, you have mentioned the tests, but their results are not presented in any part of the results section. If you conducted these tests and mentioned them, why weren't the results included?

2-In the first line of the results section, "Females 71 years old" is mentioned, while in Table 1, this value is (69.6). Firstly, duplicating information should be avoided, both in the text and in the table. Secondly, if you've mentioned it, why haven't you entered it accurately? Thirdly, in writing the article, everything stated in the introduction and method should be presented in the results section, prioritized by importance, which unfortunately has not been done in your article.

In summary, the article should be thoroughly reviewed by glaucoma specialists and optometrists, statisticians specializing in this field, to ensure accuracy. The title and introduction are intriguing and, with precise revision, can potentially be published in reputable journals in the future.

