Baishideng Publishing Group

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology
Manuscript NO: 36310
Title: MULTIPOTENT STROMAL CELLS STIMULATE LIVER REGENERATION BY INFLUENCING THE MACROPHAGE POLARIZATION
Reviewer's code: 00467030
Reviewer's country: Taiwan
Science editor: Li-Jun Cui
Date sent for review: 2017-09-20
Date reviewed: 2017-09-29
Review time: 9 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[Y] High priority for publication
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors of the submitted manuscript intend to investigate the potential effect of the umbilical cord-derived multipotent stromal cells (MSCs) on the reparative regeneration of the liver after the subtotal resection in rats. The results are interesting and would have potential clinical usage in future, in my opinion. The following comment is suggested: 1. Since the submitted manuscript is an animal study using rats, it is better to modify the title as "MULTIPOTENT STROMAL CELLS STIMULATE LIVER REGENERATION BY INFLUENCING THE MACROPHAGE POLARIZATION IN RAT" in order to reflect the content more accurately.

Baishideng Publishing Group

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology
Manuscript NO: 36310
Title: MULTIPOTENT STROMAL CELLS STIMULATE LIVER REGENERATION BY INFLUENCING THE MACROPHAGE POLARIZATION
Reviewer's code: 02439200
Reviewer's country: United States
Science editor: Li-Jun Cui
Date sent for review: 2017-09-20
Date reviewed: 2017-10-02
Review time: 12 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[Y] Grade C: Good	[Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[Y] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting manuscript that proposes that multipotent stromal cells (MSC) enhance regeneration of solid organs specifically liver regeneration. The authors use valid methodologies to address the mechanism by which MSC enhance liver regeneration. Unfortunately, it is clear if this manuscript provides new information. It is known that MSC exert anti-inflammatory actions, is it known that this is mediated by class shifting of macrophages? Additionally, although in general macrophages can be thought of as M1 or M2 this is an arbitrary designation with gradations. The authors state that in previous studies 90% of cells transplanted to the spleen are destroyed by association with CD68+ cells. If this is case what cells are mediating this presumed paracrine effect? This manuscript would be strengthened by addressing these issues. Some, minor points: The manuscript is sloppily prepared. Commas are used in the

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

figures were periods should be used. The legends refer to asterisk yet none are included. The manuscript is confusing in many places and needs to be carefully proofread. Figure 4 is not convincing. It looks like many of the cells positive for Ck18 are positive for PKH26. Also, why are not the majority of the cells positive for Ck18? In Figure 2, it appears that more cells are positive in the SR and saline at 10 day than in the SR and MSC images. Additionally, it looks like more cells are positive in the SR and saline at day 10 than day 7. What is the x-axis? How can you have relative numbers in animal survival? How were the images quantified?