ISSN: 2320-5407
International Journal of Advanced Research
Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP
www.journalijar.com
ISSN NO. 2320-5407

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-53228 Date: 09/08/2025

Title: *CASE REPORT - FAVORABLE OUTCOME OF ACUTE HYDROPS IN KERATOCONUS PATIENT TREATED WITH AUTOLOGOUS BLOOD*

Recommendation:
✓ Accept as it is .....
Accept after minor revision.....
Accept after major revision .....
Do not accept (*Reasons below*) .....

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance	✓			

Reviewer Name: Dr. S. K. Nath Date: 11/08/2025

Reviewer's Comment for Publication:
This case report demonstrates that intrastromal autologous blood injection can be a promising, safe, and effective treatment for acute hydrops in keratoconus, leading to rapid edema resolution and potential for early visual rehabilitation. While encouraging, further research with larger sample sizes and longer follow-up is essential to establish this approach as a standard treatment modality.

Reviewer's Comment / Report

Strengths:
1. **Innovative Approach:** The study presents autologous blood injection as a safe, effective, and minimally invasive alternative to gas injections for managing acute hydrops in keratoconus, which is an area of ongoing interest.
2. **Clear Clinical Outcome:** The rapid resolution of stromal edema and the stable condition at follow-up (3 months) highlight the potential efficacy of this treatment.
3. **Detailed Case Documentation:** Includes clinical assessments, OCT imaging, and photographic evidence pre- and post-treatment, supporting the findings convincingly.
4. **Literature Context:** The discussion situates the approach within existing therapeutic options, emphasizing benefits such as reduced risk of complications associated with gas injections.
5. **Personalized Patient Care:** Reinforces the importance of individualized treatment plans and close follow-up, aligning with best clinical practices.

Weaknesses:
1. **Limited Sample Size:** Being a single case report, results cannot be generalized. Larger studies or controlled trials are needed to validate the efficacy and safety.
2. **Short Follow-Up Duration:** The follow-up period of three months, while promising, may not suffice to evaluate long-term stability or late complications.
3. **Lack of Comparative Data:** While the paper discusses advantages over gas injections, it does not provide comparative cases or randomized controls to substantiate claims about relative efficacy or safety.
4. **Incomplete Methodological Detail:** The procedural specifics, such as the volume of blood injected, technique nuances, and perioperative management, are not extensively described.
5. **Potential Bias:** As a case report authored by the treating team, there exists inherent bias; broader studies are necessary for validation.