

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

On behalf of my co-authors, we thank you very much for giving us an opportunity to revise our manuscript, we appreciate editor and reviewers very much for their positive and constructive comments and suggestions on our manuscript entitled “ Research Progress and Challenges in Stem Cell Therapy for Diabetic Foot: Bibliometric Analysis and Perspectives”. (ID: 88398).

Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our research. We have studied comments carefully and have made a correction which we hope meet with approval. Revised portions are marked in yellow on the paper.

Point-by-point responses to comments of the reviewers:

Response to the comments of Reviewer#1:

Response to comment:

Specific Comments To Authors: I reviewed the manuscript which done a bibliometric analysis of using stem cell (different sources) in diabetic foot. This type of analysis is more helpful for researcher to find the researchers who extensively engage in this field of study and help generation of new collaboration. The analysis cover all aspect of bibliometry and will be informative.

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Novelty of This Manuscript: Grade B (Good)

Creativity or Innovation of This Manuscript: Grade B (Good)

Scientific Significance of the Conclusion in This Manuscript: Grade B (Good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Response: Thanks very much for your kind work and consideration on publication of our paper. On behalf of my co-authors, we would like to express our great appreciation to editor and reviewers.

Response to the comments of Reviewer#2:

Response to comment:

Specific Comments To Authors: The current work sought to conduct a bibliometric analysis of stem cell research in the field of DF over the past two decades, with the aim of depicting the current global research landscape, identifying the most influential research hotspots, and providing insights for future research directions. Actually, the current proposal is interesting and well-written. Therefore, I recommend that the current study be published after minor revisions as follows: Could the authors highlight the possible mechanisms for these findings with a diagrammatic figure?

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Novelty of This Manuscript: Grade B (Good)

Creativity or Innovation of This Manuscript: Grade B (Good)

Scientific Significance of the Conclusion in This Manuscript: Grade B (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Response: Thank you for your comment. We have added Figure 9 as the relevant mechanism diagram.

We tried our best to improve the manuscript and made some changes in the manuscript. These changes will not influence the content and framework of the paper. And here we did not list the changes but marked them in red in the revised paper. We appreciate for Editors/Reviewers' warm work and hope that the correction will meet with approval.

Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.