

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-55012

Title: "TO COMPARE THE EFFICACY OF ORAL ACETAZOLAMIDE VS EPLERENONE IN PATIENTS OF CENTRAL SEROUS CHORIORETINOPATHY"

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

- **Clear Comparative Design:** The study employs a randomized clinical trial design that effectively compares the efficacy of oral eplerenone and acetazolamide in treating CSCR, providing valuable clinical insights.
- **Defined Objectives and Methodology:** The study's aims are explicitly stated, and the methodology includes appropriate follow-up periods at 2 weeks, 6 weeks, and 3 months, which allow for a thorough assessment of treatment outcomes.
- **Quantitative Data Presentation:** The paper provides detailed tables with quantitative measurements of visual acuity, leakage on fundus fluorescence angiography, recurrence rates, and complications, facilitating objective analysis.
- **Relevant and Up-to-Date References:** The references cited are appropriate and include recent studies, which supports the credibility of the research.

Weaknesses of the Paper

- **Insufficient Ethical Details:** The paper does not mention whether ethical clearance was obtained or if patient consent was secured, which is a critical requirement for clinical studies.
- **Limited Sample Size:** The total sample size of 50 subjects may limit the generalizability of the findings and the statistical power of the study.
- **Short Follow-Up Duration:** A follow-up period of 3 months may be insufficient to evaluate long-term efficacy and recurrence, especially given the chronic nature of CSCR.
- **Lack of Blinding or Placebo Control:** The study design does not mention whether blinding or placebo control was used, which could introduce bias.
- **Absence of Detailed Adverse Effects Data:** There is minimal discussion on side effects or adverse reactions associated with each medication, which is important for clinical decision-making.
- **Formatting and Presentation Issues:** Some tables and data points could be better organized for clarity, and minor typographical mistakes are present.
- **Limited Discussion on Pathophysiology:** While the study mentions the complex pathophysiology of CSCR, it does not thoroughly explore how the medications influence the underlying mechanisms.
- **Inadequate Explanation of Statistical Methods:** The statistical analysis used for data comparison is not detailed, making it difficult to assess the robustness of results.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Reviewer Comments

- **Ethical Clearance:** The paper should explicitly state whether ethical approval was obtained from an institutional review board or ethics committee. This information appears to be missing.
- **Methodology Issues:** The methodology is generally appropriate but lacks details about randomization procedures, blinding, and statistical analysis, which are essential for evaluating validity.
- **Typographical Mistakes:** Minor typographical issues are scattered throughout, such as inconsistent spacing and abbreviations.
- **Grammar and Language:** The English language usage is generally acceptable, but some sentences could benefit from clearer phrasing and grammatical refinement.
- **Formatting:** Consistency in table formatting, headings, and referencing style needs improvement to enhance readability.
- **Clarity of Objectives, Results, and Conclusions:** The objectives are clearly presented. The results are well-organized into tables, but a narrative synthesis would improve comprehension. The conclusion accurately reflects the findings.
- **References:** The references are relevant but limited; including more recent and diverse sources would strengthen the background and discussion.
- **Additional Information Needed:** Details on ethical approval, inclusion/exclusion criteria, adverse effects, and statistical analysis methods should be included to improve transparency and reproducibility.