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| PART 1: Comments |
|  | Reviewer’s comment**Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **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.** | This manuscript provides additional evidence supporting the role of autologous PRP therapy in treating of epithelial defect following infectious corneal ulcer. The findings highlight PRP’s potential as an effective alternative or adjunct to conventional treatment, particularly in case where epithelial healing is delayed or epithelial defects persist despite standard medical management. This study also encourages further larger-scale researches to validate PRP’s efficacy and optimize its application. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | Since this is an observation study rather than a ramdomized controlled trial, the current title “Therapeutic effect of Autologous PRP …” is unsuitable and may overstate the conclusions. In my opinion, a more appropriate title could be “The potiential therapeutic effect of Autologous PRP…” |  |
| 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. | About the abstract, the results should not write about that PRP contains hight level of PDGF, TGF, FGF, IGF 1&2, VEGF, EDGF, and Interleukins as these were not measured in this study.Similarly, in the conclusion, the authors should not write that PRP have minimal side effects because the study did not evaluated or followed the any sign or symtomps of side effect of PRP, such as: infection, irritation, … |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.**  | For scientific corrections, I wonder that- Control group needde to strengthen the study’s validity: the authors should have study compare with control group who administer a standar care for persistent corneal epithelial defect to conclude that PRP are more effective than conventional therapy.- Clarify treatment groups: In this study, 50 patients was administed PRP and treatment for antibiotic (22 patients), antifungal (15 patients) and both (13 patients), so the authors should give explanation why patient received these despite of no evidence of active infection. The authors should also give more details and compare among 3 groups of patient about the time taken.- As the above comment about the abstract, this study did not evaluate the concerntration of growth factors, interleukin, and side effect of PRP, so the authors should not write about these issue in the result and conclusion.- Besides, one of the side effect of PRP in the infection, the authors should write more details about the process of PRP preparation to keep this sterile and differentiate 2 patient got infection after treatment from recurrence infection or as a complication. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | Only 2 of 26 references are newly in recent 10 years, 8 of 26 reference are predate 1995. The authors should incorporate more recent references. |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language quality is suitable. However, - the authors should use consistent terminology (“keratitis” or “corneal ulcer”)- Instead of “PRP used in 50 patients..”, the auther may consider “PRP administerd to 50 patients”. - And “PRP is found to be efficacious in healing of corneal epithelial defect in …." → "PRP was found to be effective in promoting the healing of corneal epithelial defects in …” |  |
| Optional/General comments |  |  |
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|  | Reviewer’s comment | Author’s comment *(if agreed with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?**  |  |  |
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