

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 82367

Title: Modern blepharoplasty: From bench to bedside

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02728252

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Egypt

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-16

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-18 08:57

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-24 12:47

Review time: 6 Days and 3 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 Grade E: Do not publish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	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No
------------	---------------------------------------

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This mini-review represented a brief overview of non-surgical blepharoplasty techniques, which have been reported in the literature and used in clinical settings in the past 10 years. It is well written, informative and organized. Only the table provided should be re-edited in a proper manner as they should add the type of the study, arrange the studies in a sequential manner (from the oldest to the newest), the references should be cited in the table likely as the in the text, etc.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 82367

Title: Modern blepharoplasty: From bench to bedside

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06227162

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: N/A

Professional title: N/A

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2022-12-16

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-19 08:48

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-27 11:33

Review time: 8 Days and 2 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

2 Introductions is a little confusing. Much of the phrasing is awkward and, as a result, unclear. Structuring of content within sections, and resulting flow, should be revised. In the laser section this leads to apparent rambling. Why report a focus on non-surgical options but reference Nguyen who used incisional laser? Some statement made without a sound evidence base. Eg. "Generally, the results of fractionated CO2 laser resurfacing have been shown to be comparable with traditional ablative resurfacing, however, with a lower rate of complication and less downtime. (22) (26)" - Ref.22 is an uncontrolled cohort study, to lower lids, and Ref. 26 is a review. CAHA and PLLA fillers are not reversible. Sections after the Laser one are comparatively stronger.