

에디티지 서비스를 이용해주셔서 감사합니다.

교정된 파일내용 및 에디터가 고객님의 위하여 남긴 코멘트, 그리고 아래의 메시지를 확인하여 주십시오.

에디터가 남겨드린 코멘트에 대한 답신 및 기타 교정 관련 사항은 무료 '질문사항 제출하기'를 통하여 에디터와 교신이 가능합니다. 다만 이 경우, 질문 내용은 에디터에게 직접 전달되므로 영문으로 작성하여 주시기를 부탁드립니다.*

사소한 수정에서도 언어 오류가 발생할 수 있기 때문에 저널 투고 바로 직전에는 항상 최종적으로 원어민에게 교정을 받으신 이후 투고하시는 것을 권장해 드립니다. 교정을 받으신 이후 추가 수정을 하실 경우, 프리미엄 365일 무료 재교정을 이용해 수정파일을 최종 검토를 받으시기 바랍니다 (이전 작업과 비교하여 20% 단어 수 추가 미만 일시). **

또한, 해당 작업에 대한 피드백을 통하여 보다 개선된 서비스를 받아보실 수가 있습니다. 완료된 작업 다운로드 창이나 '피드백을 주시기 바랍니다'의 아이콘을 이용하여 해당 작업에 대한 피드백을 남겨주시기 바랍니다.

새로운 작업에 대한 교정은 언제든지 에디티지 시스템에 로그인을 하시어 '작업 제출하기'를 통해 접수하여 주시기 바랍니다.



The screenshot shows the Editage website interface. At the top, there is a navigation bar with the Editage logo and the tagline "Helping you get published". Below this, there are several tabs: "작업 의뢰/문의사항", "작업내역", "결제/청구서", "개인정보관리", "피드백을 부탁드립니다", and "기타문의사항". The main content area features a "작업제출" (Submit Work) button, a "재교정 제출하기" (Resubmit for Correction) button, and a "질문 제출하기" (Submit Question) button. A green button labeled "재교정 제출하기" is also visible. A blue box on the left contains text explaining the process: "교정 후 다시 한번 재검토를 원하시는 문서를 보내시려면 작업제출 시 재교정 여부를 선택해주시고 후 연관되는 작업번호를 찾아주시길 부탁드립니다." (To re-examine a document after correction, please select 'Resubmit for Correction' when submitting your work, and find the related work number.) Another blue box points to the "질문 제출하기" button, stating: "교정에 대한 문의 사항이나 에디터의 코멘트에 따른 수정을 다시 재검토 받길 원하신다면 '질문 제출하기'를" (If you want to re-examine the correction based on questions or editor comments, please use 'Submit Question').

➤ 감사의말에 에디티지를 언급해도 될까요?

여러 저자분들께서 관련 문의를 하셨는데요. ICMJE 같은 우수 편집인위원회에서 제공하는 가이드라인을 보면 교정이나 라이팅에 도움을 받은 회사를 감사의말에 언급해도 괜찮다고 명시했습니다. 또한 저널에디터/리뷰어를 언급해도 괜찮습니다.

감사의말에 당사(에디티지)를 언급하고 싶으시다면 간략하게 아래와 같이 명시하면 됩니다.

We would like to thank Editage (www.editage.co.kr) for English language editing.

Message from your editor, Elyse

Dear Author,

It was a pleasure working on your document. Do go through my changes and comments in the edited file.

Please send me your feedback or any questions through your Editage Online account (<http://app.editage.co.kr/>). This article was very well written, so I focused on enhancing the quality of the manuscript. To that end, many of my edits were for the following:

- Word choice
I replaced some words with more accurate/formal alternatives and attempted to vary the word usage.
Example: showed → demonstrated, revealed, exhibited
- Proper comparisons
- General clarity/flow

Should you make any further revisions before submission, I'd be happy to do a final check to ensure no issues with English language.

I wish you great success with this manuscript!

Editor's report

I have provided feedback on your manuscript through specific comments along with ratings for relevant sections. The key below the table explains my ratings. I hope you find my feedback useful.

Section	Rating
Abstract A good abstract explains the aims of the research, how these were met, and the main findings.	★ ★ ★
Introduction This section should set the context for the study, clearly state the research objective, and establish the significance of the study.	★ ★ ★
Results and discussion These sections should present the data and findings in a clear and unbiased manner, and address the objective or research question stated in the introduction.	★ ★ ★
Conclusions A good concluding section notes the limitations of the study. It should mention the scope for further research as well as the implications/application of the study.	★ ★ ★

-
- ★ ★ ★ This section required only a few revisions.
 - ★ ★ Most parts of this section required revision.
 - ★ The entire section required significant revision. Please go through my comments/changes carefully.

Comments

SCOPE

I cannot comment on the suitability of this manuscript for the target journal (not specified), but I would recommend ensuring proper formatting to avoid any unnecessary delay in publication.

NOVELTY OF THE STUDY

It is evident that this study constructively builds upon previous studies but explores a promising option for stem cell therapy of damaged cardiac tissue.

RELEVANCE AND CONTRIBUTION OF THE STUDY

The relevance and contribution of the study are well conveyed. Cardiac regeneration using stem cell therapy may reduce the burden of heart disease and improve patient outcome. This study demonstrates the efficacy of a cellular resource for this purpose.

SUBMISSION READINESS

I did not identify any major gaps in this manuscript. The article is easy to follow with a defined aim and outcome. The content is presented concisely and in a well-balanced manner, with study limitations conveyed and scope for future research indicated. The biggest issue remaining is clarity—I have flagged several locations that require your attention.

Quick tip

Guideline

Avoid false or illogical comparisons by ensuring that the objects being compared are equivalent/similar.

Explanation

Statements of comparison should be constructed such that the objects being compared can actually be compared. A common example of an illogical comparison is when the property of one group is directly compared with another group instead of *the property of* that other group. For example, the comparison “The band gap of anatase TiO_2 is **larger than** rutile TiO_2 ” is illogical because the bandgap and rutile are being compared. Instead, this sentence should read “The band gap of anatase TiO_2 is **larger than that of** rutile TiO_2 ,” or even “Anatase TiO_2 **has a larger band gap than** rutile TiO_2 .” Please note that in the last sentence, the phrase “than rutile TiO_2 *has*” is implied.

A similar problem arises with sentences that begin with “Compared to” such as “**Compared to previous reports**, our coatings were more robust.” This could be “**Compared to previously reported coatings**, our coatings were more robust,” or “Our coatings were **more robust than** previously reported coatings.”

Another common problem with comparisons is when the comparison is ambiguous or incomplete, such as in the sentence “Our nanoparticles exhibited **superior** catalytic activity.” To make this sentence correct, another object should be added to complete the comparison. For example, this could be “Our nanoparticles exhibited **higher catalytic activity than that of conventional Pt catalysts**.”