

[Review Form3](#)

Book Name:	<a href="#">Achievements and Challenges of Medicine and Medical Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_4157
Title of the Manuscript:	Inverted flap technique with air tamponade and one day face down positioning for posttraumatic macular hole surgery in a young male patient in sub-Saharan Africa
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.	Even if the incidence of the posttraumatic macular holes is rare, compared to their idiopathic counterparts, the surgical management is still of high interest due to the poor response to different operatory techniques. Despite the varying contributions of vitreous traction to its pathogenesis, the current surgical techniques of vitreous surgery for traumatic macular hole are similar to those for idiopathic macular hole, but with poorer outcome. Therefore, the use of inverted flap procedure in this case with such a good result, is of interest.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I consider the title is too long. Could you, please make it shorter?	
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.	I consider the introduction of the abstract provides good background but is quite lengthy. Consider condensing the initial paragraphs to highlight the aim of the study.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The final conclusions attempt to summarize the findings, but they come across as repetitive given the already detailed account in the discussions. The conclusions section should be more succinct, emphasizing the actionable insights derived from this case report.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	I consider the references are sufficient and recent enough.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The english quality is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

[Review Form3](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b><u>Reviewer's comment</u></b>	<b><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></b>
<b><u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u></b>	<b><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></b>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<b>Name:</b>	Tanasie Cornelia Andreea
<b>Department, University &amp; Country</b>	University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Craiova, Romania