

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 59681

Title: Cause analysis and reoperation effect of failure and recurrence after epiblepharon correction in children

Reviewer's code: 02840081

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: FRCS (Ed), MD, PhD

Professional title: Director, Professor, Research Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-09-27

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-09-30 02:54

Reviewer performed review: 2020-10-08 00:05

Review time: 7 Days and 21 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Children always have failed and recurrence in the correction of epiblepharon and have reoperation due to obvious irritation symptoms and corneal injury. In the manuscript, authors collected 22 patients (40 eyes) with correction of epiblepharon failure and recurrence, including 10 males and 12 females. They found among 14 cases (28 eyes) with suture method to correct epiblepharon, 4 eyes failed in operation, 24 eyes recurred after correction. Among 8 cases (16 eyes) with epiblepharon corrected by incisional surgery, 1 eye failed and 11 eyes recurred. There were 4 eyes without recurrence in all patients. Because the lower eyelid eyelash extroversion was not ideal, and for the sake of symmetry and beauty of both eyes, reoperation was taken together. All relapsed patients were operated on the lower eyelid of both eyes at the same time, and all patients were operated under general anesthesia. Yue Wang et al accurately remove redundant epiblepharon and orbicularis oculi muscle in patients via the cilia-everting suture technique combined with lid margin splitting in some patients due to inverted lashes in the medial part of the eyelid, and to observe the therapeutic effect. This study is very useful. The authors discussed the causes of failure and recurrence after epiblepharon correction in children in detail and made recommendations based on the manuscript. Figures described the Surgical technique very clearly, explaining the specific operation and postoperative effects of the operation. Reference citations are appropriate. The only regret is that there is too much content in the DISCUSSION section, and some of the content can be incorporated into the background. DISCUSSION should be focused on what they found and learned, and comparison with previous evidence.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 59681

Title: Cause analysis and reoperation effect of failure and recurrence after epiblepharon correction in children

Reviewer's code: 02571542

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: FRCPE, MD, PhD

Professional title: Emeritus Professor, Professor, Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-09-27

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-09-30 02:54

Reviewer performed review: 2020-10-08 00:06

Review time: 7 Days and 21 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Title: Cause analysis and reoperation effect of failure and recurrence after epiblepharon correction in children. The manuscript deals with an interesting and important argument, analyzed the causes of failure and recurrence of epiblepharon in children for the first time, and summarized the operation skills of reoperation. The topic has a clinical relevance since Previous literature rarely reported the reasons for the failure and recurrence of the correction surgery of epiblepharon. The manuscript is well written: the title reflects the main subject of the article, abstract and keywords well summarize the arguments. The methodology is described in detail and is well structured. The discussion is well articulated according to results and the authors have clearly underlined the limitations and drawbacks of the manuscript. The tables/figures are representatives and of good quality. The manuscript cites appropriately the latest and authoritative references. Reading the manuscript some minor concerns have emerged: • In Abstract, the author mentioned that "22 children (44 eyes) with epiblepharon...". However, However, what they described in the text is "22 patients (40 eyes), including 36 eyes with obvious epiblepharon, 4 eyes without obvious epiblepharon, but the direction of eyelashes is abnormal, and the lower eyelid eyelashes are still attached to the eyeball and cornea." Please confirm. • In page 3 Core tip Line 1, "ailways" should be changed to "always". • In page 10 Line 11, "the scar adhesions was released," should be "the scar adhesions were released". Accepted with minor revisions.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 59681

Title: Cause analysis and reoperation effect of failure and recurrence after epiblepharon correction in children

Reviewer's code: 01507457

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MBBS, PhD

Professional title: Professor, Research Associate, Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: France

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-09-27

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-10-08 00:04

Reviewer performed review: 2020-10-08 00:29

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this study, Yue Wang et al aimed to explore the causes of failure and recurrence after epiblepharon correction in children, to accurately remove redundant epiblepharon and orbicularis oculi muscle in patients via the cilia-everting suture technique combined with lid margin splitting in some patients due to inverted lashes in the medial part of the eyelid, and to observe the therapeutic effect. The result of the study is of interest that authors thought that the type of suture method, the failure to accurately remove redundant skin and orbicularis muscle, the lack of cilia rotational suture use, and excessive reverse growth of eyelashes are the main causes of failure and recurrence after epiblepharon correction in children. Overall, this study was well conducted with good methodology and intelligible English. In the discussion part, the authors repeated the background of their study, which already appeared in the introduction part. Despite this I think the article is well written. However, they need to confirm a data. The study included 22 patients, but how many eyes are there in total? Because the data in the abstract and the text are different.