

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 77548

Title: Clinical efficacy analysis of mesenchymal stem cell therapy in patients with

COVID-19: A systematic review

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05246861 Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Indonesia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-05-14

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-05-15 11:14

Reviewer performed review: 2022-05-18 15:42

Review time: 3 Days and 4 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Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish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	[]Yes [Y]No



Baishideng Publishing

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

P	eeı	r-re	vi	ew	ær

Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous

statements Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors, This is an interesting and valuable article, but need revisions in: 1. Title: see attach file 2. Abstract ok 3. Keywords ok 4. Backgrond OK 5. Methods: see attached file 6. Result 7. Discussion and conclusion, 11. Ref. See attached file. Others OK.



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 77548

Title: Clinical efficacy analysis of mesenchymal stem cell therapy in patients with

COVID-19: A systematic review

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03947685 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Saudi Arabia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-05-14

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-05-21 06:52

Reviewer performed review: 2022-05-29 16:42

Review time: 8 Days and 9 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 [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



Baishideng Publishing

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

Telephone: +1-925-399-1568 E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-reviewer

Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dr Wang and colleagues have submitted a systematic review entitled "The clinical efficacy analysis of mesenchymal stem cell therapy in patients with COVID-19: a systematic review" for publication. I have the following comments. 1. Were the risk of bias assessed by a standardized risk assessment tool? And if not why? 2. The Cochran's Q test had the P value of <0.00001, corresponding quantity I2 was 95%, and a randomeffect model was employed. Providing a description of the level of heterogeneity would be better. 3. In the Discussion section on Page#10, the authors state "...... administered in critically ill patient". Was being critically ill one of the criterion for inclusion in the included studies? And was it an inclusion criterion for this meta-analysis? It does not seem so. 4. On Page 11, the authors write "In our meta-analysis we used random-effect model for the high heterogeneity of the analysis (Fig. 2, 3 and 4), thus we showed no significant change in the inflammatory markers when synthesising evidence, mostly for the high heterogeneity in the included clinical trials." My question is would the results be different if a fixed-effect model was used? I suggest removing this statement as it indicate the reason for the insignificance of the results was due to the type of model used rather than the actual lack of a difference. When you opted not to use a fixed-effect model due to the high heterogeneity, you showed methodological rigor. 5. According to the authors, their analysis showed no significant decrease in C-reactive protein (CRP) levels, no reduction in D-dimer levels, no decrease in interleukin 6 (IL-6) after the stem cell therapy in COVID-19 but the overall survival (OS) rate improved after the stem cell therapy in COVID-19 patients. I would like the authors to comment on this? 6. Please extensively revise the manuscript for spellings, syntax, and grammar. There is



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

too much redundancy in the text.