

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 84424

Title: Morbihan disease misdiagnosed as senile blepharoptosis and successfully treated

with short-term minocycline and ketotifen: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05457585 Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Bangladesh

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-13

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-03-15 00:56

Reviewer performed review: 2023-03-15 01:04

Review time: 1 Hour

	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair
this manuscript	[] Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [] Anonymous [Y] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

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.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 84424

Title: Morbihan disease misdiagnosed as senile blepharoptosis and successfully treated

with short-term minocycline and ketotifen: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05429012 Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Jordan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-13

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-05-06 04:09

Reviewer performed review: 2023-05-15 21:50

Review time: 9 Days and 17 Hours

	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair
this manuscript	[] Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

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.