Qeios

Peer Review

Review of: "Incidence and Predictors of Ocular Hypertension After Intravitreal Injection of Bevacizumab Among Patients Attending KCMC Hospital, 2023–2024"

Sunny, Chi Lik Au[1]

1. Tung Wah Eastern Hospital, Hong Kong, China

This manuscript presents a valuable, well-designed study with clinically relevant findings on ocular hypertension following Bevacizumab injections. Its strengths lie in its prospective design, robust statistical methods, and identification of actionable risk factors. The study tackles a significant clinical issue—ocular hypertension (OHT) following intravitreal Bevacizumab injections, a widely used treatment for retinal diseases such as diabetic macular edema and vitreous hemorrhage. Understanding OHT incidence and risk factors is vital for improving patient outcomes and preventing complications like glaucoma.

For the Introduction, the literature review is brief and lacks depth. It mentions global and African contexts but does not elaborate on specific findings, methodologies, or gaps from prior studies, weakening the rationale for the study. Concerning the recruitment process, clarification is needed; a better way to write it would be, e.g., “All eligible patients attending the KCMC eye clinic during the study period were approached consecutively, with no refusals recorded, minimizing selection bias.”

The Icare tonometer is used for intraocular pressure (IOP) measurement, but its limitations compared to the gold standard (Goldmann applanation tonometry) are not addressed. I would suggest that the authors acknowledge this in the limitations section, e.g., “The Icare tonometer, while practical for outpatient settings, may overestimate IOP compared to Goldmann applanation tonometry, though its use was consistent across all measurements.”

doi.org/10.32388/9FUKW8

Grammatical errors and awkward phrasing (e.g., “persistence IOP elevation,” “temporary post-injection IOP spikes normalized within 60 minutes”) reduce readability. I would suggest that the authors proofread thoroughly, revising sentences like “Temporary post-injection IOP spikes normalized within 60 minutes” to “Short-term IOP spikes post-injection resolved within 60 minutes in most cases.” Please consider professional editing. Addressing these weaknesses through the suggested revisions will enhance the manuscript’s quality, readability, and scientific impact, making it a stronger contribution to ophthalmology research.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.