PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Stem Cells

Manuscript NO: 65144

Title: Current advances of stem cell-based therapy for kidney diseases

Reviewer's code: 02728252

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Egypt

Author's Country/Territory: Malaysia

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-13

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-14 04:54

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-17 09:02

Review time: 3 Days and 4 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good
	[ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing
	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority)
	[Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have drafted a very good article which indeed summarizes the current stem cell-based therapy approaches to treat kidney diseases in the experimental models and in addition they reported outcomes and findings from human clinical trials. The following minor comments will improve the manuscript editing 1. Authors should flow the Journal style specifically in the references' section. 2. Minor English polishing is required. 3. Adding a representative figure for kidney histological structure will be of value to the unspecialized reader. 4. Adding a flow chart representing the different types of regeneration possible using different types of stem cells or their conditioned media is recommended.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Stem Cells

Manuscript NO: 65144

Title: Current advances of stem cell-based therapy for kidney diseases

Reviewer's code: 05405722

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Lebanon

Author's Country/Territory: Malaysia

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-13

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-14 16:38

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-20 13:23

Review time: 5 Days and 20 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

the manuscript summarises the current stem cell-based therapeutic approaches to treat kidney diseases, including the various cell sources, in animal models or in vitro studies. challenges were also described.   The manuscript is well written, however,   a serious concern is the high % of plagiarism (above 30%) when checked on turnitin. The author should minimize similarities to minimum. In the Introduction section: in treating cardiac, neural, ...renal .....;   this present article reviews stem cell-based (delete on)

  In the section 'Induced pluripotent stem cells':   -transplantation of iPSCS cells in a murine (delete the word cells).   -tang et al. demonstrated that iPSCs-derived from conditioned medium !!! this is not clear at all!! it should be conditioned medium from iPSCs not the opposite!!!!!!!!   mention the clinical trial number in the manuscript as you did in the table.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Stem Cells

Manuscript NO: 65144

Title: Current advances of stem cell-based therapy for kidney diseases

Reviewer's code: 05446072

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Pakistan

Author's Country/Territory: Malaysia

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-13

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-14 15:49

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-30 11:40

Review time: 15 Days and 19 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The title matches what's mentioned inside and a comprehensive analysis of the topic has been provided in this review. The abstract summarizes the work been presented in the article. The key words are appropriate. Latest references have been cited and an up-to-date literature review has been done. The manuscript is well organized and well presented and covers the aspects in detail. I suggest, some references from Decoppi and Perin et al can be added mentioning Amniotic fluid stem cells differentiation towards nephron progenitors

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good
	[ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing
	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority)
	[ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors responded adequately to all comments.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors did not respond to the plagiarism concerns regarding their manuscript.

8

After deleting all references and table info as suggested by the authors, the plagiarism is still unacceptable at 23%.