Point-by-point response to reviewers’ comments

Manuscript NO: 86608
Title: Recurrence of unilateral angioedema of the tongue: A case report and literature review

Reviewer 1 comments:
============= 

Improve the grammatical errors.

Response: We would like to thank Reviewer 1 for your time and efforts in reviewing our manuscript and for providing comments, which have considerably helped us improve our manuscript. We have made revisions based on your comments and have provided our point-by-point responses below. We hope that our responses and revisions appropriately address your comments. As per your advice, the manuscript has been proofread again by a native English editor. We hope that the manuscript is now clearer.

Improve the figure quality.

Response: Based on your suggestion, we have replaced the figure with a high-quality image, which we have attached separately.

Reviewer 2 comments:
============= 

The researchers may remove the word multiple from the title. In the discussion the researcher may include In future , further research is required to find the exact change in the local environment(half of the tongue)

Response: We would like to thank Reviewer 2 for your time and efforts in reviewing our manuscript and for providing comments, which have considerably helped us
improve our manuscript. We have made revisions based on your comments and have provided our point-by-point responses below. We hope that our responses and revisions appropriately address your comments.

Based on your suggestion, we have removed the term “multiple” from the title and have revised the title to “Recurrence of unilateral angioedema of the tongue: A case report and literature review.”

Further, we have also included the following sentence in the Discussion section:

“Further research is required to identify the exact changes in the local environment (i.e., the affected half of the tongue).”