



ISSN NO. 2320-5407

ISSN(O): 2320-5407 | ISSN(P): 3107-4928

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-56145

Title: *Visual Health Inequities Among Small-Scale Farmers in India: Insights from a Systematic 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: 11.02.26

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strengths of the Study

- **Originality and Relevance:** The paper addresses an important public health issue visual health inequities among small-scale farmers in India which is underexplored despite its significant implications for occupational safety and agricultural productivity. The focus on this specific population and the synthesis of Indian evidence contribute valuable insights to the field.
- **Methodological Approach:** The systematic review methodology, including sourcing peer-reviewed studies, government reports, and program evaluations, enhances the comprehensiveness of the evidence synthesis.
- **Contribution to Policy and Practice:** By highlighting barriers to eye-care access and evaluating intervention strategies such as community outreach programs, the study offers practical insights for policymakers and health program designers.
- **Data and Evidence Quality:** The review incorporates recent and relevant literature, including diverse study designs such as cross-sectional surveys, qualitative studies, and program evaluations, which enrich the understanding of the issue.

Weaknesses of the Study

- **Limited Detail on Search Strategy:** The manuscript lacks a detailed description of the literature search process, including databases searched, inclusion/exclusion criteria, search terms, and screening procedures, which affects reproducibility and transparency.
- **Quality Appraisal of Included Studies:** There is no explicit mention of the quality assessment or risk of bias evaluation of the included studies, which is critical for evidence synthesis validity.
- **Lack of Quantitative Analysis:** The review predominantly provides a narrative synthesis. Incorporating meta-analytical methods or at least a quantitative summary would strengthen the conclusions.
- **Sample Size and Scope:** The review appears to synthesize a limited number of studies, some with small or localized samples. The representativeness and generalizability of the findings may be constrained.
- **Insufficient Discussion of Limitations:** The manuscript could more explicitly acknowledge the limitations of included studies and the review itself, such as potential publication bias and heterogeneity.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Reviewer Comments

- **Title and Abstract:** The title is clear and accurately reflects the content. The abstract summarizes key points well, but including specific quantitative findings (e.g., prevalence rates or effect sizes) would enhance clarity.
- **Introduction and Objectives:** The introduction effectively establishes the context and importance of the topic. The objectives are clearly stated. However, explicitly articulating the study's specific research questions or hypotheses would improve focus.
- **Methodology and Statistical Analysis:** The methodology section needs elaboration—detailing search strategies, inclusion criteria, and study quality assessment methods. No formal statistical methods or meta-analysis are described, which limits the rigor of the synthesis.
- **Results and Discussion:** The results are presented narratively, summarizing key themes and findings. The discussion appropriately interprets the findings, though it could benefit from a more systematic comparison of studies, including summary measures where applicable.
- **Conclusion and Implications:** The conclusion effectively emphasizes the need for integrated, context-specific interventions. However, specific policy recommendations or implementation strategies could be more explicitly articulated.
- **Ethical Clearance:** As this is a literature review, ethical approval is generally not required. Nevertheless, this should be explicitly stated in the manuscript.
- **Language and Formatting:** The manuscript is generally well-written, with minor typographical and grammatical errors that need correction. Formatting of references and consistency in citation style should be verified.
- **Tables, Figures, and References:** The inclusion of a well-structured table summarizing key studies is helpful. Ensure all references are complete and follow a consistent citation style (APA 7th edition), and verify spellings/authors' names.

Verification of Prior Publication

The manuscript appears to be a recent, original submission and does not show evidence of prior publication on open-access platforms or preprint servers. A comprehensive internet search with key phrases indicates this is novel work, and no duplication or prior dissemination was detected.