PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
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

ADSCs exo has the functions of tissue repair and regeneration, inflammation inhibition and immune regulation, however, its effect on heart failure has not been confirmed. To investigate how adipose-derived mesenchymal stem cell exosomes work to treat heart failure, Wang L et al. conducted this study. They found that the secretion of mesenchymal stem cells from adipose tissue can increase ATP level, block cardiomyocyte apoptosis, and enhance the heart function of animals susceptible to heart failure. The inhibition of Bax, caspase-3 and p53 protein expression may be related to this process. The methods are properly presented, the results are presented on 2 tables and 7 figures and are clearly discussed. The author analyzed the results from many angles. The references are quite appropriate to the subject of research. Thank you for a useful and important synopsis of this important topic. The reviewer has only one suggestion: Figure 5 and Figure 6 need to be rearranged and the last figure on P13 page should belong to Figure 5. In addition, the reviewer thinks this manuscript can further benefit from grammatical revisions.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
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

Dear authors, thank you for submitting your paper to the World Journal of Stem Cells. In this study, the surface markers of ADSCs-EXO were identified, and Exosomes may be effectively extracted from adipose-derived mesenchymal cells and adipose tissue. After injecting ADSCs-EXO into HF rats, it was found that LVEF, LVFS and SV of rat heart function indexes were significantly increased, suggesting that ADSCs-EXO could alleviate cardiac function in rats with heart failure. Very interesting study, the authors describe the protocol and results in great detail. I only have a couple of minor comments relating to this manuscript. Comments 1: Abbreviations should have their full name at first appearance, for example, ADSCs in abstract and text. Comments 2: The full text of the writing about ADSCs needs to be unified. Now the reviewers see that some write ADSCs, some write Adscs, and some write about ADSCS. Comments 3: For Figure 5, the NOTES mention Compared with Col group * P<0.05; Compared with HF group # (P<0.05). But * and # are not seen in this Figure. Comments 4: The CONCLUSION is not well written. This section should succinctly and cowardly present the findings and implications that are within the scope of the data you have presented in the preceding

4

Results. You should state only conclusions that are directly supported by the evidence presented and the implications of the findings presented. Comments 6: What does the Control group on page 6 and 9 mean? According to the reviewer's understanding, it may represent the ADSCS-EXO group. Such descriptions need to be consistent throughout.