

Dear Editor-in-Chief,
Dear Editorial Board,

We respectfully send you our corrected manuscript entitled "this and that".
The manuscript has been revised in light of the reviewers' and scientific editor's comments.
Additionally, extensive English grammar and syntactic corrections were made.
In the revised version, all changes are highlighted in yellow.
We hope the improved version is ready for publication.

Yours Sincerely,

Ferenc Sipos

Response to Scientific Editor

1., This review is a commentary article on the recently published work by Ma ZJ et al. (Ma ZJ, Yang JJ, LuYB, Liu ZY, Wang XX. Mesenchymal stem cell-derived exosomes: Toward cell-free therapeutic strategies in regenerative medicine. World J Stem Cells 2020;12:814-840. doi: 10.4252/wjsc.v12.i8.814 PMID: 32952861) and aims to summary disagreements in the therapeutic use of mesenchymal stem cell-derived secretome. This review article is well written, timely, and highly relevant to the possible future development of new therapeutic strategies for various diseases. The authors proposed that the use of MSC-derived secretomes for therapeutic purposes must be approached with extreme caution, and there is no doubt that its safety is a very important issue to consider. The authors proposed that the use of MSC-derived secretomes for therapeutic purposes should be approached with extreme caution, and there is no doubt that their safety is a very important issue to consider. Therefore, this commentary article should be published.

Our answer:

We appreciate your positive assessment and are pleased that you concur with us regarding the critical nature of considering adverse side effects in addition to the wonderful therapeutic effects of MSC-derived secretome.

Responses to Reviewer 1

We sincerely thank you for your comments and critical remarks.
Here are our answers:

1., This review aims to summary the disagreements in the therapeutic use of mesenchymal stem cell-derived secretome. However, the manuscript is not well written.

Our answer:

We would like to point out to the honorable reviewer that our manuscript is not a "review," but a "commentary." (Field of Vision type manuscripts are Commentaries.)

The article's scope and bibliography are also distinct from those of a "review" article. Kindly read and evaluate the manuscript in light of these points.

2., Abstract should be independent and self-explanatory, and have the same amount of main information as the literature, that is, the necessary information can be obtained without reading the full text. However, the summary written by the author lacks logic and fails to name the significance of writing this review.

Our answer:

As a result of the preceding, the abstract describes for the first time the review article upon which the commentary was based and the positive aspects highlighted by the authors. Finally, we indicate the points of contention that do not appear in the article on which we are commenting but that we believe are necessary for a comprehensive presentation of the subject.

3., The purpose of this article is to elucidate the disagreements in the therapeutic use of mesenchymal stem cell-derived secretome. However, the full text of the summary of this part of the content is too single, too few references. For example, advantages and disadvantages of secretory and conditioned media from MSCs derived secretome as new therapeutic strategies. Immunomodulation and anti-inflammatory activity of MSCs derived secretome. Anti-apoptotic activity, wound healing and tissue repair effects, and neuroprotective and neurotrophic effects of MSCs derived secretome, etc.

Our answer:

Our intention is not to elaborate on a subject in a commentary article, as we are only making a comment on another article. As a result, adverse effects to take into account when considering the therapeutic use of MSC-derived secretome are displayed. The study of the negative effects of the therapeutic use of MSC secretome is very novel; not many scientific results have been published about it. However, the current research shows that MSC-derived secretome can have a number of negative effects that should be taken into account when it is used in medicine.

4., The content of introduction should include: why is this study conducted? What is the theoretical or practical basis for setting the topic? What are the innovations? What are the theoretical and/or practical implications? This review does not have this part.

Our answer:

As a commentary article, these aspects raised by the reviewer are not even part of the article. In the first part, after the importance and then the classification of MSCs, the advantages of their therapeutic use were highlighted. In this connection, we also turn to the characterization of the secretome. The disadvantages of MSC therapy are then briefly summarized to draw the reader to the importance of the therapeutic use of MSC-derived secretome. We then indicate that the commented article also addresses this topic and focuses on its benefits.

For ease of understanding, each unit of the introduction has been divided into paragraphs.

5., The discussion section should define the key words involved in the paper's ideas, what scope to discuss the problem, how to use this idea. The discussion section of this review should be rewritten.

Our answer:

The second and third sections of the “commentary” discuss the negative consequences of MSC-derived secretome and possible future remedies. The text has been updated with the most recent available literature.

6., There are misnomers and grammatical errors in the language, which need to be further modified.

Our answer:

Extensive grammatical and syntactic changes have been made to the article.

We sincerely hope that you will find our commentary article acceptable for publication based on our explanations and responses.

Response to Reviewer 2

1., The manuscript "Disagreements in the therapeutic use of mesenchymal stem cell-derived secretome" (Manuscript Type: Field of Vision) presents a perspective on the use of secretomes, with their advantages and disadvantages in relation to MSCs. I am in favor of publication.

We sincerely thank you for your positive comments. Extensive grammatical and syntactic changes have been made to the article.

Response to Reviewer 3

1., In this manuscript, the authors proposed that the use of MSC-derived secretomes for therapeutic purposes must be approached with extreme caution. I totally agree with them. Secretomes is currently one of the hottest spots in the stem cells field. There is no doubt that its safety is the most important issue. So, acceptance should be recommended for this manuscript.

We sincerely thank you for your positive comments. Extensive grammatical and syntactic changes have been made to the article.