

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Stem Cells

Manuscript NO: 35654

Title: A rat model of anal sphincter injury and two ways for stem cells administration.

Reviewer's code: 00058573

Reviewer's country: India

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2017-08-21

Date reviewed: 2017-08-31

Review time: 10 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The study is well written But it is too lengthy. Everything is three times the required size. Even in INTRODUCTION, a mini review has been written on fecal incontinence. The authors need to make this more concise. The text is whopping 5551 words. Kindly make the text (Introduction, Methods, Results & Conclusions) to less than 2500, References 75 to 35 and Figures from 9 to 5.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Stem Cells

Manuscript NO: 35654

Title: A rat model of anal sphincter injury and two ways for stem cells administration.

Reviewer's code: 02446101

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2017-09-06

Date reviewed: 2017-09-11

Review time: 4 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This study established a new method to treat the anal sphincter injury and proved their methods meaningful. So, the manuscript provides some new ideas to the readers. Acceptance should be recommended for the publication.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Stem Cells

Manuscript NO: 35654

Title: A rat model of anal sphincter injury and two ways for stem cells administration.

Reviewer's code: 00004011

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2017-09-06

Date reviewed: 2017-09-14

Review time: 8 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

it is a very interesting manuscript

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Stem Cells

Manuscript NO: 35654

Title: A rat model of anal sphincter injury and two ways for stem cells administration.

Reviewer's code: 00070577

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2017-09-06

Date reviewed: 2017-09-15

Review time: 9 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Trebol et al. reported the biosutures and injections are suitable for cell delivery. The paper showed the usefulness of this procedure. There are some concerns; 1) The authors employed ASC; adipose-derived stem cells. I think the adipose derived mesenchymal stem or stromal cells may be better. 2) The authors do not mentioned the mechanisms why ASC showed therapeutic effect. The authors should show the expression protein etc... in results or discussion.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Stem Cells

Manuscript NO: 35654

Title: A rat model of anal sphincter injury and two ways for stem cells administration.

Reviewer's code: 00069130

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2017-09-06

Date reviewed: 2017-09-24

Review time: 18 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Well written manuscript. The authors would have used b-Gal which would have been more specific. Nonspecific green fluorescence is shown by many cells (in mice naturally). Authors would have also killed mice and tried to isolate the GFP +ve cells and looked for live cells (live-dead staining). Overall, the paper is satisfactory and I recommend the manuscript for favour of publication.