

Format for ANSWERING REVIEWERS



October 22, 2014

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the amended manuscript in Word format. File name: ESPS manuscript NO 12611.

Title: Substrates for Clinical Applicability of Stem Cells

Author: Sanjar Enam, Sha Jin

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Stem Cells*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 12611

The manuscript has been significantly improved according to the comments and suggestions of the reviewers. Major modifications are yellow color highlighted in the amended manuscript.

Reviewer 1:

- 1) The title has been modified to accurately reflect the contents of the manuscript.
- 2) To impart a strong sense of the clinical applications of substrates and provide clear-cut recommendations, we have added a Table that highlights the advantages and disadvantages of various substrates. We have also added a conclusion section that highlights the benefits and limitations of the different classes of substrates. Additionally, we have emphasized a commercially available synthetic peptide substrate Synthemax Surface in the conclusion section as a prime example of substrates that should be used for clinical applications.
- 3) To address the composition and use of Matrigel on its own, we have mentioned various articles in the beginning of extracellular matrix protein section on page 3 and 4 that were not mentioned in the original manuscript.
- 4) The second sentence in the abstract has been changed to make it clear and direct.
- 5) All sentences which include the author's name now have a numbered reference as well, according to the wishes of the reviewer.
- 6) Minor grammatical errors have been corrected.

Reviewer 2:

- 1) Minor grammatical errors have been corrected along with the definitions of acronyms.

Reviewer 3:

- 1) More insights have been provided into the data that was reviewed by adding more detailed information and by restructuring/rewording sentences throughout the manuscript so that the reader can easily understand the conclusions made in various articles.
- 2) A table that summarizes the pros and cons of substrates has been added, as per the reviewer's comment.
- 3) All the abbreviations have been defined at first mention. Furthermore, great care was taken to keep

the sentences clear and concise. Lastly, we have compiled a list of abbreviations that have been used in the manuscript.

4) The three sentences have been reworded to make the points more clear.

5) Synthemax Surface has been defined in the synthetic peptide section under the heading “peptide acrylate surfaces” along with the description of how it is synthesized. It is further discussed in the conclusion section as well.

Reviewer 4:

1) The typing error has been corrected at the beginning of the fifth page.

Reviewer 5:

1) A table that concisely summarizes the pros and cons of each substrate has been included in the revised manuscript.

Thank you again for publishing our manuscript in the *World Journal of Stem Cells*.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Sha Jin
Assistant Professor
Department of Bioengineering
SUNY Binghamton