

Enago Peer Review Lite

AI-Based Structured Review Report with Expert Reviewer insights (Lite)

Manuscript Details

Assignment Code	ABCDE-1	Total Word Count	5193 Words
Manuscript Title	Clinical Course and Surgical Outcomes of Acquired *****: A Retrospective Study		
Article Type	Original Article		
Journal URL	https://www.ojo.com/		

Table of Contents

AI-Based Structured Review Report with Expert Reviewer insights (Lite)	1
Score Summary	2
Manuscript analysis.....	2
Reviewer's Concluding Remarks.....	12
Current Manuscript Status and Recommendation	12
Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)	13

Enago | Disclaimer: This report was compiled by our Trink AI's proprietary technology and Peer Review Expert(s) after careful consideration of your manuscript considering several parameters (read FAQs on the last page for exclusions). The author(s) should read the report carefully and address the reviewer's comments in their manuscript prior to journal submission. This report should not be considered as a guarantee of submission readiness or journal acceptance.

Score Summary

- **Total Checks:** 24
- **Passes:** 22
- **Warnings:** 1
- **Fails:** 1
- **Score:** 91.66%

Manuscript analysis

No	Category (Input)	Checkpoints (Input)	Result (AI generated, Reviewer validated)	Brief Comments (AI generated)	Relevant Document Content (AI generated)	Reviewer comments
1	Title Improvement	Is the title descriptive and concise?	Pass	The title is descriptive and concise.	"Clinical Course and Surgical Outcomes of Acquired *****: A Retrospective Study" clearly conveys the study's focus on a specific condition, its progression, and surgical outcomes in a hospital setting.	The title presents the main content of the article and should be attractive to the relevant readers.
2	Title Improvement	Does the title accurately reflect the content?	Pass	The title accurately reflects the content.	The title matches the study's main research question and findings related to the clinical course and surgical	The original article features an efficient and impactful working title. The title contains relevant and

Enago | Disclaimer: This report was compiled by our Trinka AI's proprietary technology and Peer Review Expert(s) after careful consideration of your manuscript considering several parameters (read FAQs on the last page for exclusions). The author(s) should read the report carefully and address the reviewer's comments in their manuscript prior to journal submission. This report should not be considered as a guarantee of submission readiness or journal acceptance.

No	Category (Input)	Checkpoints (Input)	Result (AI generated, Reviewer validated)	Brief Comments (AI generated)	Relevant Document Content (AI generated)	Reviewer comments
					outcomes of acquired comitant esotropia.	significant words that accurately represent the content of the work, and the sentence structure is clear and easy to read.
3	Title Improvement	Is there a need for title improvement?	Fail	The title could be more specific.	No relevant source content found.	The overall title [word count: 12; characters (with spaces): 81] adheres to the formatting guidelines specified by the target journal, which mandates the use of a concise title with a maximum word limit of 10–12 words (no more than 145 characters total, including spaces). Accordingly, the working title is regarded as both succinct and informative.
4	Abstract and Highlights Improvement	Does the abstract capture the main research findings?	Pass	The abstract summarizes the main findings.	The abstract provides a summary of the study's aims, methods, results, and conclusion, including the incidence of ACE,	Although primary information regarding cell culture and the challenges associated with large-scale cell expansion is provided, the

Enago | Disclaimer: This report was compiled by our Trinka AI's proprietary technology and Peer Review Expert(s) after careful consideration of your manuscript considering several parameters (read FAQs on the last page for exclusions). The author(s) should read the report carefully and address the reviewer's comments in their manuscript prior to journal submission. This report should not be considered as a guarantee of submission readiness or journal acceptance.

No	Category (Input)	Checkpoints (Input)	Result (AI generated, Reviewer validated)	Brief Comments (AI generated)	Relevant Document Content (AI generated)	Reviewer comments
					mean age at presentation, and the surgical success rate.	subsequent sentences fail to provide a clear description of the results obtained from the current study.
5	Abstract and Highlights Improvement	Is the abstract clear and concise?	Pass	The abstract is clear and concise.	The abstract is structured with clear subheadings: Introduction, Methods, Results, and Conclusion, providing a concise overview of the study.	Please effectively organize abstract's content into a concise summary featuring discrete sections deemed essential by the target journal. Please highlight the foundational information, the rationale for conducting the present research, the methodologies used, the resulting findings, and the conclusive insights derived from it. Correspondingly, major revisions are deemed necessary.
6	Abstract and Highlights Improvement	Does the highlights section	Warning	The highlights section is not present.	No highlights section is provided in the manuscript, which is	Highlights were not provided for review.

Enago | Disclaimer: This report was compiled by our Trinka AI's proprietary technology and Peer Review Expert(s) after careful consideration of your manuscript considering several parameters (read FAQs on the last page for exclusions). The author(s) should read the report carefully and address the reviewer's comments in their manuscript prior to journal submission. This report should not be considered as a guarantee of submission readiness or journal acceptance.

No	Category (Input)	Checkpoints (Input)	Result (AI generated, Reviewer validated)	Brief Comments (AI generated)	Relevant Document Content (AI generated)	Reviewer comments
		capture the main findings?			typically a separate section summarizing key findings.	
7	Background and Literature	Are key references included?	Pass	The manuscript includes references to previous studies on acquired comitant esotropia.	References 1-23 are listed in the manuscript.	The Introduction section provides a detailed overview of the international GMP regulations, GTP laboratory regulations, China GMP environmental requirements for laboratories, environment monitoring, cleanroom environmental monitoring, and LIMS.
8	Background and Literature	Is the literature review comprehensive?	Pass	The literature review covers the incidence, etiologies, clinical course, and surgical outcomes of ACE.	The manuscript discusses various studies on acquired comitant esotropia.	Few assertive statements provided appropriately substantiated by citing relevant references. As a result, significant revisions to the text appear necessary to address these issues.

No	Category (Input)	Checkpoints (Input)	Result (AI generated, Reviewer validated)	Brief Comments (AI generated)	Relevant Document Content (AI generated)	Reviewer comments
9	Background and Literature	Is the literature section up to date?	Pass	The literature section discusses recent trends related to ACE, including its rise during the COVID-19 pandemic.	The manuscript cites recent studies published in 2020-2023.	The contents seem to lack key comments that provide the necessary context linking GMP guidelines and practices with cell culture and packaging, its challenges, and the benefits of automation; these factors seem crucial to provide a comprehensive account of the primary motivation of the current study and the research problem addressed herein.
10	Objectives Clarity	Are primary objectives clearly stated?	Pass	The primary objective of the study, investigating the aspects of ACE in participants, is clearly stated.	The study aims to investigate the incidence, etiologies, clinical course, and surgical outcomes of acquired comitant esotropia.	it is highly recommended that the authors significantly revise the current article to at least include the following details: a. Background data highlighting traditional cell culture practices b. GMP regulations and their role in the current study

Enago | Disclaimer: This report was compiled by our Trinka AI's proprietary technology and Peer Review Expert(s) after careful consideration of your manuscript considering several parameters (read FAQs on the last page for exclusions). The author(s) should read the report carefully and address the reviewer's comments in their manuscript prior to journal submission. This report should not be considered as a guarantee of submission readiness or journal acceptance.

No	Category (Input)	Checkpoints (Input)	Result (AI generated, Reviewer validated)	Brief Comments (AI generated)	Relevant Document Content (AI generated)	Reviewer comments
11	Objectives Clarity	Are secondary objectives clearly stated?	Pass	The study does not mention specific secondary objectives, focusing primarily on investigating ACE aspects.	The study aims to analyze factors that influence successful surgical outcomes.	The impact of cell culture automation strategies and their advantages.
12	Objectives Clarity	Is the clarity of the objectives satisfactory?	Pass	The objectives are clearly defined, focusing on the incidence, etiologies, clinical course, and surgical outcomes of ACE.	The objectives are clearly stated and easy to understand.	The motivation behind the current study, along with a brief summary of the key findings.
13	Results Presentation	Is the number of tables and figures appropriate?	Pass	The manuscript includes relevant tables and figures to support the study findings.	There are 5 tables and 1 figure in the manuscript.	The findings presented in the results section are very limited, primarily consisting of experimental settings, tabulated data, and figures, without any accompanying interpretations.

No	Category (Input)	Checkpoints (Input)	Result (AI generated, Reviewer validated)	Brief Comments (AI generated)	Relevant Document Content (AI generated)	Reviewer comments
14	Results Presentation	Are tables and figures well presented?	Pass	Tables and figures are clearly labeled and easy to interpret.	The tables and figure are clear and easy to understand.	Within this particular context, the tabulated data and/or figures lack specific information in the written account, and their significance and pertinence to the present study are not adequately explained.
15	Results Presentation	Is there a need for additional tables/figures?	Pass	The existing tables and figures adequately cover the study data.	No additional tables or figures are needed.	The section lacks possible interpretations of the findings obtained in the current study. As a result, significant revisions at the author's end appear necessary to address these issues.
16	Interpretation of Results and Conclusions	Are the conclusions supported by the data?	Pass	The conclusions drawn align with the study results and data presented.	The conclusions are based on the results of the study.	The distribution of ACE types and the high proportion of surgical cases are discussed in relation to previous literature, highlighting similarities and differences. This supports

Enago | Disclaimer: This report was compiled by our Trinka AI's proprietary technology and Peer Review Expert(s) after careful consideration of your manuscript considering several parameters (read FAQs on the last page for exclusions). The author(s) should read the report carefully and address the reviewer's comments in their manuscript prior to journal submission. This report should not be considered as a guarantee of submission readiness or journal acceptance.

No	Category (Input)	Checkpoints (Input)	Result (AI generated, Reviewer validated)	Brief Comments (AI generated)	Relevant Document Content (AI generated)	Reviewer comments
						the study's goal to investigate the clinical course and treatment outcomes of ACE.
17	Interpretation of Results and Conclusions	Is the interpretation of results adequate?	Pass	The interpretation of results is clear and logical based on the study findings.	The manuscript provides a thorough interpretation of the results.	The lack of significant factors influencing surgical success is acknowledged and discussed in the context of previous research, demonstrating a balanced interpretation of the findings
18	Interpretation of Results and Conclusions	Are recommendations for future research included?	Pass	The study includes recommendations for future research to enhance understanding and treatment strategies for ACE.	The manuscript suggests future research directions.	The conclusion suggests future research directions, but it is much detailed in the discussion section such as conducting prospective, multicenter studies with larger sample sizes and diverse populations.

Enago | Disclaimer: This report was compiled by our Trinka AI's proprietary technology and Peer Review Expert(s) after careful consideration of your manuscript considering several parameters (read FAQs on the last page for exclusions). The author(s) should read the report carefully and address the reviewer's comments in their manuscript prior to journal submission. This report should not be considered as a guarantee of submission readiness or journal acceptance.

No	Category (Input)	Checkpoints (Input)	Result (AI generated, Reviewer validated)	Brief Comments (AI generated)	Relevant Document Content (AI generated)	Reviewer comments
19	Emphasis on Study Limitations	Are the study limitations clearly stated?	Pass	The study limitations are clearly stated in the discussion section.	The manuscript discusses the limitations of the study, including its retrospective design and small sample size.	It acknowledges the limitations of the research and suggests future directions for investigation, contributing to the overall knowledge and understanding of ACE
20	Emphasis on Study Limitations	Are potential biases addressed?	Pass	The study acknowledges potential biases due to its retrospective design and single-center setting.	The manuscript discusses potential biases, including selection bias.	The conclusion effectively summarizes the key findings of the study and draws scientifically justified conclusions.
21	Emphasis on Study Limitations	Are suggestions for mitigating limitations provided?	Pass	The study suggests future directions for prospective, multicenter studies to validate the findings.	The manuscript suggests future research directions to address the limitations of the study.	The authors acknowledge the limitations of the study design and sample size, and they refrain from extrapolating the results to populations or settings not represented in the study.

No	Category (Input)	Checkpoints (Input)	Result (AI generated, Reviewer validated)	Brief Comments (AI generated)	Relevant Document Content (AI generated)	Reviewer comments
22	Interest to Journal Audience	Is the study relevant to the journal's audience?	Pass	The study is relevant to the journal's audience, as it provides new insights into the management of ACE.	The study is relevant to ophthalmologists and researchers in the field of strabismus.	The journal's scope encompasses a wide range of ophthalmological topics, including strabismus and related surgical interventions. The research presented in the manuscript aligns with the journal's focus on clinical research, innovative treatment approaches, and outcomes in ophthalmic care.
23	Interest to Journal Audience	Is the study's significance clear?	Pass	The study's significance is clear, as it highlights the importance of early diagnosis and intervention.	The study contributes to the understanding of acquired comitant esotropia and its management.	The manuscript's thorough methodology and focus on improving surgical outcomes align with the journal's emphasis on quality research that contributes to clinical practice.
24	Interest to Journal Audience	Are practical applications discussed?	Pass	The study discusses practical	The manuscript discusses the practical	Publishing in the AJO would lend credibility to the

Enago | Disclaimer: This report was compiled by our Trinkka AI's proprietary technology and Peer Review Expert(s) after careful consideration of your manuscript considering several parameters (read FAQs on the last page for exclusions). The author(s) should read the report carefully and address the reviewer's comments in their manuscript prior to journal submission. This report should not be considered as a guarantee of submission readiness or journal acceptance.

No	Category (Input)	Checkpoints (Input)	Result (AI generated, Reviewer validated)	Brief Comments (AI generated)	Relevant Document Content (AI generated)	Reviewer comments
				applications, such as the use of the medial rectus recession-lateral rectus resection technique.	applications of the study's findings.	research findings and increase their visibility within the ophthalmology community.

Reviewer's Concluding Remarks

The manuscript references several prior studies published in reputable journals, including the British Journal of Ophthalmology, Acta Ophthalmologica, JAMA Ophthalmology, and Eye. These are considered high-tier journals in the field of ophthalmology, indicating that the research is supported by relevant and impactful prior work.

Current Manuscript Status and Recommendation

- Although your manuscript is well written, it needs to be formatted according to the journal guidelines before submission. Please check if you need to opt for our formatting service: [Instructions to Authors Check](#)

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)

[Q] I have received the Peer Review Lite (PRL) report; do I have to make all the changes suggested in the PRL report?

[A] The PRL report summarizes the technical improvement areas like adequateness of information related to each part of your manuscript. We highly recommend that you review all the feedback in the interest to improvise the overall quality of the manuscript.

[Q] How does the AI-based preliminary review work?

[A] Our AI-based preliminary review uses a secure, locally deployed large language model fine-tuned on academic manuscripts. It identifies technical errors and inconsistencies, guiding our expert reviewers in providing detailed feedback.

[Q] What is the difference between Peer Review Lite and a [Full Pre-submission peer review service](#)?

[A] Peer Review Lite offers a streamlined version of full pre-submission peer review service, focusing on technical accuracy, logic, and scientific rigor without delving into the methodology. It is more affordable and quicker, making it ideal for early-stage feedback.

[Q] Can I rely solely on Peer Review Lite for journal submission?

[A] While Peer Review Lite improves your manuscript's quality, it is recommended to use it as a supplementary review. PRL report does not cover all aspects of peer review; aspects like novelty and methodological rigor are not covered. For a more detailed evaluation, choose [Full Pre-submission peer review service](#).

[Q] How is the expert feedback integrated with AI-generated insights?

[A] The AI-based preliminary review identifies key areas for improvement, and our experienced reviewers build on this by providing detailed, human-expert feedback, ensuring a balanced and high-quality review.

[Q] How do I read the score summary and what does it indicate?

[A] The score summary includes the following components:

- PRL Checkpoints/Total Checks: These represent the questions used for structured peer reviews of a standard research paper.
- Pass/Warning/Fail: These are judgments made by AI or human reviewers based on the manuscript's content.
- Overall Score: This is the percentage of "Pass" results out of the total checks.
- Interpretation: A higher score indicates a better manuscript in terms of successfully passing peer review criteria.

[Q] Can I add additional services to the Peer Review Lite package?

[A] Yes, you can add ancillary services such as an [Advance Editing](#), [Artwork Editing](#), [Manuscript Submission Assistance](#), [Full Pre-submission Peer Review](#) services to the Peer Review Lite package for a more comprehensive service.

[Q] How accurate is the AI-Based Preliminary Review?

[A] It provides a high level of accuracy in identifying technical errors and inconsistencies, which are then further refined by expert reviewers.

[Q] Is my manuscript's confidentiality guaranteed during the review process?

[A] Yes, confidentiality is a top priority. All reviews are conducted securely, and your manuscript will not be shared or used outside the review process.

For any assistance, simply mail us at publish@enago.com. Your dedicated assignment manager will be happy to help you with all your needs and queries.

Thank you for choosing Enago as your publication support partner.

Enago | Disclaimer: This report was compiled by our Trinka AI's proprietary technology and Peer Review Expert(s) after careful consideration of your manuscript considering several parameters (read FAQs on the last page for exclusions). The author(s) should read the report carefully and address the reviewer's comments in their manuscript prior to journal submission. This report should not be considered as a guarantee of submission readiness or journal acceptance.