

Dear reviewers:

I am very grateful to your comments for the manuscript. According with your advice, we amended the relevant part in manuscript. The detailed answers are as follows.

Reviewer #1

Specific Comments to Authors: This manuscript is good regarding reporting a very rare case. The following points have to be taken into account: - language needs to be edited by English native speaker, several linguistic issues were observed. - some parts of discussion need to return to the introduction. - figures need to be more described by adding arrows at certain points.

Answer: 1) The language in this manuscript has been edited by English native speaker and the editing certificate has been uploaded together; 2) Some descriptions of Morbihan disease in “discussion” have been transferred to “introduction”; 3) In Figure 1, yellow lines have been added to show changes of ptosis (Figure 1A, 1B, and 1C) and the area indicated by the yellow arrow (Figure 1B) shows the erythema triggered by biopsy. In Figure 2, yellow arrows were added to show the dilated lymphatics (Figure 2A) and mast cell (Figure 2B).

Reviewer #2

Specific Comments to Authors: Major Comments: 1. Are there controversies in this field? What are the most recent and important achievements in the field? In my opinion, answers to these questions should be emphasized. Perhaps, in some cases, novelty of the recent achievements should be highlighted by indicating the year of publication in the text of the manuscript. 2. The results and discussion section is very weak and no emphasis is given on the discussion of the results like why certain effects are coming in to existence and what could be the possible reason behind them? 3. Conclusion: not properly written. 4. Results and conclusion: The section devoted to the explanation of the results suffers from the same problems revealed so far. Your storyline in the results section (and conclusion) is hard to follow. Moreover, the conclusions reached are really far from what one can infer from the empirical results.

Answer:

1) Diagnosis of atypical Morbihan disease cases is difficult and treatment of the disease remains controversial. The relevant descriptions have been supplemented in “introduction”; 2) The results and discussion section have been modified accordingly, diagnosis of the atypical case and the importance of mast cell in treatment were emphasized. 3) Conclusion has been modified accordingly; 4) Results and conclusion in this manuscript have been revised according to the review comments. This case report supplements the clinical manifestations of atypical Morbihan cases, and suggests that inflammatory blepharoptosis can be a diagnostic clue in rare condition. In addition, based on literature review and the successful treatment of our patient, minocycline combined with antihistamines should be the prior treatment choice in Morbihan disease with increased mast cells. The case report provided more clinical evidence for the treatment of Morbihan.