

Response Letter

First of all, I would like to thank the reviewers for spending their time reviewing my work. In this document I will try to respond as best as possible to the suggestions made by the reviewers. I have indicated in red, in the manuscript the changes made according to the suggestions. I have found some typographical and grammatical error that I have corrected (red indicated).

Reviewer 1:

In this review article, the authors reported that exosomes derived from Mesenchymal stem cells (MSC) could be a novel therapeutic tool in the field of regenerative medicine. This is an emerging field that cellular therapy without cell. In the meantime, this could be interesting to generate exosomes for clinical applications. However, the authors only cited two clinical trials and one of patients died after 7 months. Nevertheless the process of treating patients with exosomes is not described in detail. The mechanism of exosomes function still remains unclear, so the "clinical perspective" could not be positive and linked to the expected clinical application recently. The title is easily to lead to misunderstanding. Also the authors are suggested to rearrange the story logic and re-summarize to help readers to understand well. The current version is not very easy to follow.

Again, thank you very much for your review. In all the literature reviewed I only found those two clinical trials. I agree that the title could lead to error. Given your suggestion, I could change it for this: *"Mesenchymal stem cells from different sources and their derived exosomes: a **pre**-clinical perspective"*

In the other hand, taking into account your suggestions and those of another reviewer I added number to the tables following the guidelines of the journal and I hope it makes it easier to follow the article.

Reviewer 2:

Really it is an interesting opinion review about clinical perspective of bone marrow, adipose tissue and umbilical cord mesenchymal stem cells-derived exosomes. Surely, I enjoyed reading this review. The shortcomings are in the following: 1. Please add the number of references in your tables, for example (Damania et al., 2018 [23]) as the style of referencing is numerical not alphabetical. 2. Please use one abbreviation for microRNA (miRNA). 3. Could you please extend your paragraph in the core tip section, it is very short. 4. It is well written with good English editing but minor grammatical errors and typos are found.

Thank you very much for your kind comments.

1. I have added the bibliographic reference number in the table, thanks for the suggestion.

2. I changed microRNA by ~~mi~~~~cro~~RNA.

3. I extended the paragraph in the core tip section:

Core tip: We review the latest data on the use of exosomes in various disease states at the translational level. Cell therapy "without cells", is an emerging field many researchers direct their efforts to transfer these results to the clinic.

4. I find some error types and I changed. I have indicated the corrections in red in the text.

Reviewer 3:

This opinion review is well written and of interest.

Thank very much for your words.