

Jan 7, 2023

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 82367

Title: Modern blepharoplasty: from the bench to the bedside

Reviewer's codes: 06227162 and 0278252

Dear Editor of WJCC,

On behalf of the other authors and myself, I would like to extend my gratitude for the efforts and time spent reviewing our submission. The Reviewers make excellent points and offer valuable suggestions to improve the manuscript. **Please find the responses in bold font under each of the comments made by the reviewer below, which can also be found in red font in the revised manuscript:**

**Reviewer 1** (code: 06227162)

*Introductions is a little confusing. Much of the phrasing is awkward and, as a result, unclear. The structuring of content within sections, and the resulting flow, should be revised.*

**Our apologies for the confusion. The Introduction and content within the sections have been edited and modified for better flow, as suggested.**

*In the laser section this leads to apparent rambling. Why report a focus on non-surgical options but reference Nguyen who used incisional laser?*

**Our apologies for the apparent rambling. As correctly mentioned, Nguyen used incisional laser instead of a non-surgical approach but was still referenced as an example in order to address the importance of a clear and complete pre-operative and/or pre-procedural counseling, as explained in the corresponding section, thus providing correct information and avoiding setting false expectations in patients.**

*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.*

**With regards to the laser section, the following modifications have been made to address the issues raised, which include:**

*"As already reported by other reviewers, such as Vreck et al., the results of fractionated CO2 laser resurfacing have been shown to be comparable with traditional ablative resurfacing, however, with a lower rate of complications and less downtime. (26) Given its bias of being an uncontrolled cohort study, similar results have also been reported in a paper published by Garcia CP et al. (22)"*

**With regard to the classification of filler materials, the following modifications have been made to address the issues raised, which include:**

*"There is also a distinction that can be made based on their reversibility, which includes fillers that are reversible (bovine collagen, HA) and irreversible (PMMA, calcium hydroxyapatite, poly-L-lactic acid, fat)."*

**Reviewer 2** (code: 0278252)

*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.*

**We are grateful to the Reviewer for the positive comments. The table has been modified so that the studies are arranged in chronological order based on publication date. The references have been cited in the table, as suggested.**

Once again, your valuable comments and assistance with our paper are greatly appreciated. We look forward to your final decision regarding our modifications and hope that all concerns have been addressed appropriately.

Kind regards,

Marco Zeppieri, Giovanni Miotti, Giacomo Pederzani, Carlo Salati and Pier Camillo Parodi.