

[Review Form3](#)

Book Name:	Achievements and Challenges of Medicine and Medical Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_4101
Title of the Manuscript:	Bilateral sporadic aniridia: review of management
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The comprehensive review of various management modalities, including treatment options for associated complications like keratopathy, glaucoma, and cataract, makes it particularly valuable for ophthalmologists in developing countries. The case report effectively highlights the challenges of managing this condition in resource-limited settings while providing an extensive literature review of current treatment approaches.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title "Bilateral sporadic aniridia: review of management" is appropriate and accurately reflects the content of the manuscript.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is well-structured and comprehensive, covering the purpose, presentation, and management aspects. However, it could benefit from including a brief conclusion statement summarizing the key takeaway points for readers.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically sound and accurate. It thoroughly covers the genetic basis (PAX6 mutations), clinical manifestations, and various management approaches with appropriate scientific explanations and current evidence-based treatments.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references are sufficient and appropriate for the scope of the article. However, considering this is being published as a book chapter in 2024, some more recent references (post-2008) could be added to provide updates on newer management approaches, particularly regarding artificial iris implants and keratoprosthesis outcomes.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is suitable for scholarly communication. The text is clear, well-organized, and maintains appropriate medical terminology while remaining accessible to the target audience.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript would benefit from: Additional recent case series or studies on long-term outcomes More details on genetic counseling aspects The manuscript is well-written, scientifically sound, and provides comprehensive coverage of the topic. The suggested minor revisions (updating references, expanding conclusion, adding recent treatment outcomes) would enhance its value as a book chapter.	

[Review Form3](#)

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</u>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rachana Kafle
Department, University & Country	University of Houston, USA