

Peer Review File

Article information: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/aes-20-97>

Comment 1. This manuscript should conform to the written form of review.

Reply 1. We have improved the structure of the manuscript as recommended.

Comment 2. This manuscript mentions the applications of each material in the repair of periocular defects, however, it is better to point out the advantages, disadvantages and indications of each material by comparative analysis.

Reply 2. We have added the advantages and disadvantages where it was possible to find them in the literature. Unfortunately, most of the literature aimed on periocular region are short series, case reports or retrospective studies that compares the materials to conventional techniques (e.g. autografting), not to other materials, therefore comparative analysis was not possible.

Comment 3. The structure of the article is too messy and not clear enough. It is recommended to use subheadings to make the article clearer.

Reply 3. Subheadings were used as recommended.

Comment 4. In the abstract conclusion section, I think the order should be: Dermal substitutes are useful, when it is not possible to close the defect with any other conventional surgical technique. Bioengineered dermal substitutes are not frequently used in the periocular region.

Reply 4. Discussion was separated from conclusion as recommended. The Conclusion was made clear.

Comment 5. I think the conclusion section is more like a discussion, and the conclusion section should state some clear results.

Reply 5. Discussion was separated from conclusion as recommended. The Conclusion was made clear.

Comment 6. Twenty-one references are really not enough for a review.

Reply 6. Unfortunately, the topic lacks on literature. Even though there are several articles about usage of bioengineered materials in medicine, most of the concentrate on burn trauma of the body or management of the ulcerations. As there are some other ophthalmic reviews on this topics (or discussion in the referenced articles) many of them use references without any connection to ophthalmology – we didn't write the article in this fashion, because most of these review on one hand have

more references and are longer, but unfortunately they are very messy and only the minor part of such reviews cover the topic of usage of these materials in ophthalmic plastic surgery and the rest of the article is often of low value for the ophthalmic plastic surgeon. Our aim was to write strictly about the topic and to provide the surgeon clear reference about usage of these materials in periocular region.

Comment 7. There is only one picture of Integra Bilayer Matrix Wound Dressing, and pictures should be provided for each material for clearer explanation.

Reply 7. We have asked other companies and journals for pictures, but there was no answer up to this date. We try to contact them again.