

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Stem Cells

Manuscript NO: 48051

Title: CELLULAR DIFFERENTIATION CAPACITY OF HUMAN BREASTMILK STEM CELLS: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW.

Reviewer's code: 02728252

Reviewer's country: Egypt

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-04-04 10:53

Reviewer performed review: 2019-04-06 08:09

Review time: 1 Day and 21 Hours

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

It is an interesting systematic review about cellular differentiation capacity of human breastmilk cells, however the following should be considered: 1. The title should explain that this systematic review is organized for in-vitro studies. 2. Why the authors didn't



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

use the term differentiation in the search strategy as the systematic review intended to detect the number of the in-vitro studies performed for hBSCs differentiation into three lineages. 3. I think there is a conflict as the authors reported that they included articles in English language only and in other places they reported that they selected articles in Portuguese and English languages. 4. Where is the table of RoB for the selected studies? 5. The discussion section is too long and I think they should focus on the studies they were selected according g to their inclusion criteria. 6. English editing is preferred.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

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

BPG Search:

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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Stem Cells

Manuscript NO: 48051

Title: CELLULAR DIFFERENTIATION CAPACITY OF HUMAN BREASTMILK STEM CELLS: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW.

Reviewer's code: 00609434

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-04-04 08:06

Reviewer performed review: 2019-04-10 09:48

Review time: 6 Days and 1 Hour

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

The manuscript from Ribeiro Pacheco et al. is a review describing the characteristics and differentiation capacities of human breastmilk stem cells (hBSC). A thorough analysis of the literature on the topic from 2007, year of their isolation and description, to date, has



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

been performed by the authors. This review is interesting and updated in its description of current knowledge on these recently discovered adult stem cells which seem to hold very promising features. I find it worthy of publication although there are a few points that should be revised before publication. In the following, the points to be revised: 1. The order of appearance of the references is very confusing. The introduction ends with citation of reference 10 and then in the next chapter (materials and methods) continues with reference 51. Then in the Discussion references begin again from number 11. The references should be numbered consequentially as they are cited for the first time in the text, this does not apply to this manuscript, please correct. 2. Figure 4 is original or is from another paper? Please clarify. 3. In Table 2 there is an error in the description of markers O4 and GFAP, please correct both.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

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

BPG Search:

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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Stem Cells

Manuscript NO: 48051

Title: CELLULAR DIFFERENTIATION CAPACITY OF HUMAN BREASTMILK STEM CELLS: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW.

Reviewer's code: 03372822

Reviewer's country: Portugal

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-04-04 10:13

Reviewer performed review: 2019-04-15 00:18

Review time: 10 Days and 14 Hours

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 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

The authors present a systematic review on the characteristics and potential of human breastmilk stem cells (hBSC). The manuscript presents an extensive amount of data, but it is based only in 5 articles that were selected in the end after applying the criteria

mentioned in the methods. Although the authors refer that one of the criteria of selection of the articles was to be written in English, they mentioned at some point that Portuguese data was accounted. This is confusing and should be clarified. The authors have selected articles presenting in vitro data, this should be very clear in the abstract and even perhaps in the title of the manuscript. Although hBSC may express Nanog, Oct4 and Sox2 and other markers of pluripotency, there is lack of strong evidence that these cells are truly pluripotent. In some sections, the authors also mentioned that hBSC do not form teratomas, but in others they do. Please address this discrepancy and clarify in the text. The figure legends should give more explanations, particularly in Figure 4, it is not clear whether the staining has been made by the authors or adapted from another article. Please clarify. It would be of interest to describe pertinent data obtained in vivo on hBSC, if it exists, and even compare it with tumorigenic processes. The abstract should be revised, as some parts are not easy to understand.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

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

BPG Search:

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