

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/atm-22-3506>

First External Peer Review

Reviewer A

It is an interesting case report with good images. My major concern regarding the entire manuscript – it is written in a very informal language and is missing correct medical terminology in specific areas of the text (please see below). I'm also missing a section or sentence(s) of complications regarding conjunctival cryoablation in the comment section.

Reply 1: Thank you for reviewing the manuscript and for the valuable comments.

Yes, it was originally written in a very informal language, in a rush to meet the deadline provided by the journal for submission of this article.

The text has been change Hoped, reworded, modified and rewritten to meet with the suggested requirements and changes through out the manuscript. All the changes are highlighted in red ink and hope the manuscript meets the standard of the journal for publication.

Specific comments:

Key words: You should only have between 205 key words according to the checklist. Please decide which of your 14 keywords that are most important for this case report. Also, don't use words from your title as key words.

Reply 2: Key words reduced to 5

Abstract

Page 2, line 28-36: The abstract is written in a semi informal language and I would recommend reviewing and rewrite some of the sentences to a more formal language. An example of the informal language would be the following two sentences “The patient was reassured that most of the time these masses turn out to be benign. He was recommended to wait and watch because frequently the growths regress spontaneously.” The use of ‘reassured’ is not a scientific word.

Reply 3: Abstract has been rewritten and changed to formal and scientific language

Introduction

The entire introduction is written in a very informal language – please rewrite the entire introduction to a formal language style. Examples of the informal language can be seen

below but please be aware that it is the entire language in the introduction that needs to be addressed.

Page 3, line 38: The word 'bothersome' is not a scientific word that should be written in a scientific case report.

Page 3, line 39: The word 'quite common' is not a scientific expression that should be written in a scientific case report. Please remove 'quite'.

Page 3, line 39-40: Informal language "Often, patients are not much 39 concerned about these initially disfiguring growths." Please reword to a formal language.

Page 3, line 46: Do not use 'I', 'we', or 'ours' in a scientific manuscript.

Page 3, line 42: Reference(s) are needed for this statement regarding rapid growth of papillomas, follicular concretions, chalazion granulomas etc.

Reply 4: The introduction has been modified, rewritten and in formal scientific language, removing the suggested non-scientific words and terms.

Case report

Page 3, line 49: It is fine to use "something" in a history, but you should not use the word something twice. I would recommend using 'a growth' instead of 'something growing'.

Page 3, line 50: The word "denied" could be understood as a negative and judgmental word – I would recommend "He did not recall any recent ...".

Page 3, line 51-52: Since your adnexal examination was abnormal for the left eye, I would recommend that you are writing "Ophthalmic examination of both eyes were within normal limits for the anterior and posterior segment, as well as for the adnexal structures of the right eye. Vision and intraocular pressure were within normal limits for both eyes."

Page 3, line 55-57: This is an informal language sentence that should be adjusted to a more formal language (e.g., 'reassured' and 'seemed' are not proper words that should be used in a scientific manuscript).

Page 3, line 57: Reference is needed for a statement like this!

Page 3, line 57-59: You can't start a sentence with a 'But'. Please rewrite this sentence to a formal language.

Page 3, line 59: 'The patient' instead of 'his', and no 'the' in front of lesions.

Page 3, line 59-60: There's 28 words in this sentence – there's a "rule" that a well written sentence should have 15-20 words on average – please rewrite this sentence so it is easier to read and understand for the reader.

Page 3, line 60: Informal language – rewrite sentence please.

Page 3, line 62: Almost is not a scientific word – be specific!

Page 3, line 63: 'All the time' is not a scientific statement that should be used in a scientific manuscript – rewrite please.

Page 3. Line 65: "infected appearing" discharge is not a scientific term that should be

used in scientific manuscript – reword please (use mucoid, mucopurulent, purulent etc.).

Page 3, line 65: Use another word than ‘forced’ please.

Page 3, line 67-70: Two very difficult and informal sentences – please rewrite so they are formal and easier to read. The Figure 3 reference does not need to be added here since you have already added it to the description of the discharge in line 65.

Page 3, line 75: In-toto instead of in one-piece – please remember to use correct medical term.

Page 3, line 76: ‘much dissection’ is not a correct medical description – use mild or moderate.

Page 4, line 78: Did you apply your cryoablation once or twice, for how long did you performed the cryoablation, and did you use a probe or spray approach. Did you use liquid nitrogen in a canister or a compressed carbon dioxide system? Be specific with this procedure!

Page 4, line 82-83: Do you have a longer follow-up than one month? That’s not very long??

Reply 5: The text has been modified and changed to formal scientific and medical language and terminology, deleting the suggested words, and using formal medical terms.

Procedure of cryoablation has been described in more detail, as suggested, It has been 3 month follow up at the most recent examination and a longer follow up is indicated and included in the revised manuscript.

Comments

Page 4, line 85: Remove ‘very’.

Page 4, line 89: Don’t start a sentence with a ‘But’ and don’t use ‘our’ in a scientific manuscript – rewrite please and remember a formal language.

Page 4, line 90-91: This is a very difficult sentence to read and understand – please rewrite and remember a formal language.

Page 4, line 95: ‘Angry’ is not a medical term – please rewrite.

Page 4, line 95: ‘Turn into malignant tumors’ is a more correct way to saying that benign tumors become malignant.

Page 4, line 97: The discussed case – not ‘The case in discussion’

Page 4, line 92-101: This section is difficult to read and understand. Please rewrite to make it flow better.

Page 4, line 105: Remove ‘even’.

Page 4, line 112: No ‘The’ in front of patients.

Page 4, line 116: Do not use ‘we’ in this sentence – please rewrite.

Page 5, line 121: Don’t use ‘best effort’ in a scientific manuscript – rewrite this sentence please and remember a formal language.

Page 5, line 127: ‘dinitrochlorobenzene immunotherapy’ seems to be a different size

text?

Page 5 (comments): I'm missing a section about complications from cryoablation and if any studies have looked at recurrency time.

Reply 6: All the suggestions have been followed. The comment section has been rewritten, modified, corrected, and written in formal scientific language.

Figures:

Good images – the many blue arrows in Figure 1 and Figure 2 make it a little difficult to appreciate the pictures. Would it be possible to remove them all and then place an asterisk in the middle of each mass? Just a suggestion – see how it looks.

Reply 7: The thick blue arrows have been replaced by finer blue arrows to delineate the extent of the growths. Placing an asterisk did not convey the meaning well.

Would it be possible to have a follow-up figure multiple month/years post-surgery?

Reply 8: I wish I had taken a post-operative follow-up picture at the last visit, three months post-op. Attempt has been made to call back the patient for the same reason, and post-op photo will be submitted, if possible, before the publication of this case report (if accepted).

Reviewer B

I think that conjunctival papilloma is relatively common and this case report will not provide new information.

Reply: Conjunctival papilloma is relatively common 'among infants and young children' and relatively 'uncommon in a middle-aged patient.' Also, three years history of the papillomas demonstrates the natural course of these benign growths (most of the times, benign). Pedunculated papilloma growing in inferior fornix, and not at its common presentation at the caruncle, and similarly, the sessile papilloma growing at an unusual site of 'tarsal conjunctiva (not at the limbus)' make this case worth sharing with the ophthalmic community.

Second External Peer Review

General comment:

Comment 1: This is a much better and professional written case report – well done!! I enjoyed reading the entire text and I have only minor comments to work on (see below).

Specific comments.

Comment 2: Page 3, line 43: A 56-year old Afro-American – please add old.

Comment 3: Page 4, line 76: I believe ‘Due’ should be deleted and the sentence should read: ‘Care was taken ...’.

Comment 4: Page 4, line 77: Either ‘1 mm’ or ‘one millimeter’ (one mm looks weird).
Page 5, line 105: Either use ‘over a year’ or ‘at least a year’ – you can’t use ‘at least over a year’.

Comment 5: Page 5, line 106: I would not use ‘an accidental finding’ since it sounds like you did not know what you were looking at. I would recommend changing ‘accidental’ to ‘additional’.

Comment 6: Page 5, line 108 and line 116-117: You are repeating yourself a lot regarding to growing rate over two years – please adjust your text to less repeating – this will mean you will have to delete a couple of sentences.

Comment 7: Page 5, line 119-126: This a lot of repeating of your case report. I would recommend that you are looking at the two sections from page 5, line 103-126 and rewrite this to a much shorter and less repetition text.

Re: Thank you again for reviewing the manuscript. The corrections have been made and suggestions have been followed through in blue ink throughout the text.