

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Stem Cells

**Manuscript NO:** 39155

**Title:** Stem cell-derived exosomes - an emerging tool for myocardial regeneration

**Reviewer's code:** 00233953

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Li-Jun Cui

**Date sent for review:** 2018-04-10

**Date reviewed:** 2018-04-10

**Review time:** 9 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

there are no specific comments

### INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

*Google Search:*



**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

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ [Y] No

***BPG Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ [Y] No

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Stem Cells

**Manuscript NO:** 39155

**Title:** Stem cell-derived exosomes - an emerging tool for myocardial regeneration

**Reviewer's code:** 03551035

**Reviewer's country:** Romania

**Science editor:** Li-Jun Cui

**Date sent for review:** 2018-04-10

**Date reviewed:** 2018-04-14

**Review time:** 4 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript by Lazar et al. discusses the potential role of exosomes as theranostic tools for myocardial regeneration. This is a topic undergoing intense study and interest at the present time, but the editing of manuscript needs to be revised. The punctuation of sentence or paragraph is not clear that may cause reading difficulty; English is to be

further polished. A careful editing is needed to correct spelling mistakes, for example on page 2, abstract, line 6, and respectively page 3, paragraph 2, line 7 "may attempts....." should be read as "many attempts....."; also, "beneficial" is repeatedly written as "benefical" (e.g page 2 abstract, page 3 paragraph 4, page 5 paragraph 8). Other examples of frequent misspelling are: "indward" instead of "inward" and "apaptosomes" instead of "apoptosomes". Since the theme of the paper is "Stem cell-derived exosomes – an emerging tool for myocardial regeneration", I suggest the authors should expand a little more the section "Exosomes as myocardial regenerative tools". In addition, I think the impact of manuscript would be improved if authors would address the challenges related to isolating high yields of pure exosomes from plasma/serum and from cells cultures.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ [Y] No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ [Y] No

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Stem Cells

**Manuscript NO:** 39155

**Title:** Stem cell-derived exosomes - an emerging tool for myocardial regeneration

**Reviewer's code:** 02602138

**Reviewer's country:** Iran

**Science editor:** Li-Jun Cui

**Date sent for review:** 2018-03-30

**Date reviewed:** 2018-04-19

**Review time:** 20 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I read the manuscript written by Dr Lazar and colleagues to review exosomes role in myocardial regeneration named: "Stem cell-derived exosomes - an emerging tool for myocardial regeneration". This is undoubtedly a hot topic in the field of cardiology with high impact on clinical practice though ethical considerations prevents from rapid

employment of any findings in patients before studying all aspects of the issue in experimental setting. The authors' effort to prepare a comprehensive narrative review is very important to provide a view on how exosomes work as nanocarriers and may be regarded as potential stem cell vehicles. However, there are concerns about this paper: The main message of the paper is not clear enough. The author should clarify the extent of impact that exosomes may have in stem cell therapy in humans. They have not concluded that failed stem cell therapy so far will be resolved by employment of exosomes or we are not at the level to judge right now. I think it is a question to be clearly addressed. There is potential for redundancy all around the text. Core tip is almost the same as abstract and abstract is most similar to the introduction. I recommend rephrasing the core tip emphasizing on two important messages of the review which are emergent role of exosomes as therapeutic agents and diagnostic biomarkers. this is true for titles so that it is evident from the titles that they talk two times on "role of exosomes in myocardial regeneration". Moreover, there is significant overlap between ACS and MI so that these two entities could be discussed in the same or two following sections. I highly recommend forming a list of contents and merging similar topics to make the text appear more integrated. The review is claimed to be focused on exosomes' role; However, there are ambiguities in some parts for instance when they talk about exosomes as biomarkers the reader is confused whether or not and exosome could be served as biomarker as all section is about the role of MiRNA which is included in exosome. My proposal is giving brief explanation on terms such as Killip score which is not familiar to readers who are not cardiologist. The English writing needs some polishing and probably more important is meticulous review of the text by authors to correct many mistakes caused by rapid preparation of the text.??

#### INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT



**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

*Google Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

*BPG Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No