



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Experimental Medicine*

Manuscript NO: 96412

Title: Autologous blood in the management of ocular surface disorders

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05817547

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Postdoc

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2024-05-06

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ru Fan

Reviewer accepted review: 2024-08-18 12:27

Reviewer performed review: 2024-08-31 20:25

Review time: 13 Days and 7 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Overall, this manuscript provides valuable and valid information. I do not see any major issues in this manuscript; however, a few minor issues need to be addressed as pointed out below. 1- The manuscript is generally well-written, but there are minor grammatical errors that need to be addressed. Additionally, some sentences could be simplified for clarity. 2- The abstract is well-written and provides a clear overview of the topic. However, a few areas could be improved for clarity and impact. For instance, the abstract could benefit from a more explicit statement of the review's objective or research question. Additionally, while the challenges are mentioned, it might be useful to briefly touch on the specific gaps in the literature that this review aims to address. This would strengthen the abstract by highlighting the review's contribution to advancing the field. 3- The introduction provides a good overview of ocular surface disorders and the rationale for using autologous blood. However, the objectives could be more clearly defined. 4- The discussion flows logically, but the connections between sections could be more coherent. Consider revising the section headings for better alignment with the content. 5- The conclusion could emphasize the practical impact of the findings and



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: office@baishideng.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

suggest how they could change current clinical practices. 6- The manuscript touches on the implications of the findings but should discuss potential future research directions in more depth, particularly the long-term effects and safety of using autologous blood. 7- The manuscript references the PRISMA 2009 guidelines for the systematic review. However, the PRISMA guidelines were updated in 2020, with the new version published in 2021. The PRISMA 2020 guidelines provide more comprehensive and up-to-date recommendations for conducting and reporting systematic reviews. I strongly recommend revising the manuscript to align with the PRISMA 2020 guidelines to ensure that your review meets the latest standards and provides maximum clarity and precision.