

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-55011

Title: "EFFECTIVENESS OF WARM COMPRESSION ON TEAR PRODUCTION AMONG DRY EYE SYNDROME AND ITS PREVALENCE: A NARRATIVE REVIEW"

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: 29.11.25

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strengths of the Paper

- **Comprehensive Literature Synthesis:** The paper collates data from multiple recent studies, providing a broad overview of warm compression therapy's effectiveness in treating dry eye syndrome.
- **Clear Focus on Non-invasive Treatment:** It emphasizes a simple, cost-effective, and non-invasive intervention, which is highly relevant for clinical practice.
- **Inclusion of Prevalence Data:** The review offers valuable epidemiological insights into dry eye disease across different populations, highlighting the disease's significance.
- **Use of Multiple Data Sources:** The paper includes studies employing various research designs such as clinical trials, cross-sectional studies, and randomized controlled trials, enriching the robustness of the review.
- **Alignment with Sustainable Development Goals:** The discussion links the findings to larger health goals, emphasizing public health relevance.

Weaknesses of the Paper

- **Lack of a Clearly Defined Methodology:** The review process lacks detailed criteria for study selection, quality assessment procedures, and a systematic approach.
- **Limited Critical Appraisal:** There is minimal critique of the included studies' validity or potential biases, which weakens the strength of the conclusions.
- **Inconsistent Formatting:** There are issues with formatting, such as irregular paragraph structures and inconsistent headings, affecting readability.
- **Insufficient Detail on Study Results:** Summaries of individual study outcomes lack depth and specific data points, limiting the reader's understanding.
- **Absence of a Structured Discussion:** The paper could benefit from a more critical discussion of the findings, gaps, and future research directions.

Reviewer Comments

- **Ethical Clearance Status:** Since this is a narrative review, ethical clearance is typically not required. However, the paper does not mention whether ethical approval was necessary or obtained, which should be clarified.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- **Issues in the Methodology:** The methodology section describes the inclusion and exclusion criteria but lacks detail about the search strategy, databases used, keywords searched, and quality assessment tools applied. This diminishes reproducibility and reliability.
- **Typographical Mistakes:** Minor typographical errors exist, such as inconsistent spacing and capitalization issues, which should be corrected.
- **Grammar and English Language Quality:** Overall, the language is understandable but contains grammatical errors and awkward phrasing that could be improved for clarity and professionalism.
- **Formatting Issues:** The manuscript exhibits inconsistent formatting with irregular font styles, unexplained line breaks, and misaligned headings. Standardized formatting should be adopted.
- **Clarity of Objectives, Results, and Conclusions:** The objectives are clearly stated. However, the results section is somewhat superficial, lacking detailed quantitative findings. The conclusion effectively summarizes the potential benefits of warm compression but should better integrate critical analysis.
- **Adequacy of References:** The references cited are recent and relevant, but the referencing style is inconsistent, affecting professional presentation.
- **Missing or Incomplete Information:** The review should specify the search period, databases searched, and the process of selecting studies to enhance transparency. Additionally, a discussion on limitations of the review and biases would strengthen the manuscript.