November 2, 2020

Dear editor：

Please find attached files of revised manuscript in word format.

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

Author: Yue Wang[1], Yang Zhang[2], Ning Tian[3]

Name of Journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 59681, Retrospective Study

First of all, we would like to express our sincere gratitude to the reviewers for their constructive and positive comments. Also, thank you for your careful guidance of this article. Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the reviewer.

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

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.

Replies to Reviewer 1

1.

In the discussion part, the authors repeated the background of their study, which already appeared in the introduction part.

Response: Thank you for your insightful suggestion. We accept the suggestion and delete the words in the discussion that are duplicated in the preface.
2.
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.

Response: This is due to clerical errors and careless inspection. A total of 22 children with 44 eyes were collected, and 40 eyes recurred after trichiasis, so the description in the abstract should be 22 cases with 40 eyes.

Reviewer #2:
Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)
Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)
Conclusion: Minor revision
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.

Replies to Reviewer 2
Specific Comments
1.

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.

Response: Thank you for your insightful suggestion. This is due to clerical errors and careless inspection. A total of 22 children with 44 eyes were collected, and 40 eyes recurred after trichiasis, so the description in the abstract should be 22 cases with 40 eyes.

2.
In page 3 Core tip Line 1, “ailways” should be changed to “always”.

Response: The “ailways” has been changed to “always”. This is due to clerical errors and careless inspection.

3.
In page 10 Line 11, “the scar adhesions was released,” should be “the scar adhesions were released”.

Response: Ok, “the scar adhesions was released,” should be “the scar adhesions were released”.

Reviewer #3:
Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)
Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)
Conclusion: Minor revision
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 epiblapharon 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.

Replies to Reviewer 3

1.

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.

Response: Thank you for your insightful suggestion. We accept the suggestion and delete the words in the discussion that are duplicated in the preface.

Replies to "EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS"

1. Please provide the original figure documents.

Response: We provide them.

2. I found the authors did not write the "article highlight" section. Please write the "article highlights" section at the end of the main text.

Response: Thank you for your insightful suggestion.

ARTICLE HIGHLIGHTS

Research background：

Previous literature rarely reported the reasons for the failure and recurrence of the correction surgery of epiblepharon. As far as we know, this study analyzed the causes of failure and recurrence of epiblepharon in children for the first time, and summarized the operation skills of reoperation.

The main topics:

Children always have failed and recurrence in the correction of epiblepharon,

and have reoperation due to obvious irritation symptoms and corneal injury. What are the causes? What should we pay attention to in reoperation?

Research objectives:
To explore the causes of failure and recurrence after epiblepharon correction in children, and to observe the therapeutic effect after reoperation.

Research methods：
22 children (40 eyes) with epiblepharon, were treated due to correction failure and recurrence. During reoperation, we should accurately remove redundant epiblepharon and orbicularis muscle. Rotational suture technique and Lid margin splitting can be used.

Research results：
After reoperation, all the patients were corrected. Photophobia, rubbing the eye, winking and tearing disappeared. The corneal injuries were repaired. Follow-up observation for 6 months showed no recurrence of epiblepharon.

Research conclusions：
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.

Research perspectives：
In the future, more cases of recurrence of lower eyelid epiblepharon in children will be collected, and will be followed up for a longer time after reoperation.

3. The reference numbers will be superscripted in square brackets at the end of the sentence with the citation content or after the cited author's name, with no spaces.

Response: ok, we accept and adopt the suggestion.

Conclusion: 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.

Thank you for your advice. After receiving the comments, we read the article

carefully and found some small loopholes in the language of the article and made modifications. And I changed the style of the references According to the suggestion, we changed the relavant description.
Thank you again for publishing our manuscript in the World Journal of Clinical Cases and look forward to hearing from you soon.

With best wishes,
Sincerely Yours,
Yue Wang