

**Manuscript NO:** 66280

**Title:** Stem cell therapy applied for digestive anastomosis: Current state and future perspectives.

Trebol J *et al.*

## **RESPONSE TO THE SCIENCE EDITOR:**

Dear science editor,

Thank you very much for your commentaries and suggestions.

We have taken them into consideration and have also read the reviewer's appreciations.

In this new version we send, the changes to the text appear highlighted to answer the reviewer and editors. You will be able to find them also in this document.

Below you can find the specific answers to your specific queries and commentaries.

Other changes suggested by BPG are the following:

- We have added the Audio Core Tip.
- We have updated, signed and attached the "Copyright License Agreement" statement in PDF format.
- We have added all the requested associated documents to the main text, excluding biostatistics review certificate (due to changing to review manuscript type), Approved Grant Application Form (s) or Funding Agency Copy of any Approval Documents (because the study was not supported by any grant or financial support) and PRISMA 2009 Checklist.

### **(1) *Science editor:***

1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a systematic reviews of the stem cell therapy applied for digestive anastomosis. The topic is within the scope of the WJSC. (1) Classification: Grade B; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The authors report a systematic review. However, the authors should follow the preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses (PRISMA); and (3) Format: There are 4 tables and 1 figure. (4) References: A total of 123 references are cited, including 25 references published in the last 3 years; (5) Self-cited references: There are 6 self-cited references. The self-referencing rates should be less than 10%. Please keep the reasonable self-citations that are closely related to the topic of the manuscript, and remove other improper self-citations. If the authors fail to address the critical issue of self-citation, the editing process of this manuscript will be terminated; and (6) References recommend: The authors have the right to refuse to cite improper references recommended by peer reviewer(s), especially the references published by the peer reviewer(s) themselves. If the authors found the peer reviewer(s) request the authors to cite improper references published by themselves, please send the peer reviewer's ID number to the [editorialoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:editorialoffice@wjgnet.com). The Editorial Office will close and remove the peer reviewer from the F6Publishing system immediately.

Thank you very much. Concerning the type of manuscript, we are going to request a change from "Systematic review" to "review" as we will explain later. All references to "systematic review" in the main text have been erased and replaced by "narrative or descriptive review". We have reviewed again the self-citation references; they are less than 10% (really 5%) and we consider them directly related to the topic or to similar research fields. Reviewers have not suggested us to add any reference.

2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B.

3 Academic norms and rules: No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search.

4 Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. No financial support was obtained for the study. The topic has not previously been published in the WJSC.

5 Issues raised: (1) The title is too long, and it should be no more than 18 words; (2) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor; and (3) The "Article Highlights" section is missing. Please add the "Article Highlights" section at the end of the main text.

Regarding the **issue 1**) "The title is too long, and it should be no more than 18 words", the current title has 12 words (66% of the limit), and we think that it is a precise description of the review content. We would like to maintain its current composition. It also fulfills BPG criteria exposed on "Guidelines\_for\_Manuscript\_Preparation\_and\_Submission-Review.pdf", page 3: "1.1 Title. The title should be no more than 12 words."

**Issue 2:** "The authors did not provide original pictures". We have created and attached to the new submission a fully modifiable Power Point file containing the original figure.

As it is also mentioned later, we have also created a Word document containing the 4 tables added to the main text in order to editors could modify and process their format.

**(3)** The "Article Highlights" section is missing. Please add the "Article Highlights" section at the end of the main text. ANSWER: dear editor we have asked to change the manuscript type from systematic review to review, see more information on the answer to the reviewer. Please apologize for the inconveniences caused by this demand, we were confounded when we send the first paper version regarding the manuscript real type. In simple review manuscripts "article highlights" section is not demanded. If you want us to perform anyway that section, say to us and we will prepare it.

6 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

We hope that with these modifications our manuscript accomplishes all BPG criteria to be accepted for publication.

Thank you very much.

Kind regards.

## RESPONSE TO THE COMPANY EDITOR-IN-CHIEF:

**(2) *Company editor-in-chief:*** I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Stem Cells, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.

Dear editor-in-chief,

Thank you very much for your very gentle commentaries. We have tried to do our best to accomplish BPG publishing requirements.

As you can see in this answering letter, we have read Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors, and we have tried to answer and take into consideration all their suggestions.

The most important change is that we have requested to change our manuscript type from "systematic review" to "review", we think our manuscript fits better in this type of BPG article. A more detailed explanation about this request is provided below with the answer to the reviewer. All references to "systematic review" in the main text have been erased and replaced by "narrative or descriptive review".

In this new version we send, the changes to the text appear highlighted to answer the reviewers and editors. You will be able to find them also in this document.

Other changes suggested by BPG and attended are the following:

- We have added the Audio Core Tip.
- We have added all the requested associated documents to the main text, excluding biostatistics review certificate (due to changing to review manuscript type), Approved Grant Application Form (s) or Funding Agency Copy of any Approval Documents (because the study was not supported by any grant or financial support) and PRISMA 2009 Checklist.

Regarding the document "criteria for manuscript revision by authors" we have added at the end of the discussion section the following paragraph:

The main limitation of this study is its own nature; we have presented a descriptive review because we consider that there are a few published studies and that they are very heterogeneous to perform a systematic review and meta-analysis.

We hope that with these modifications our manuscript accomplishes all BPG criteria to be accepted for publication.

Thank you very much.

Kind regards.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 66280

**Title:** Stem cell therapy applied for digestive anastomosis: Current state and future perspectives

**Reviewer's code:** 02728252

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Egypt

**Author's Country/Territory:** Spain

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-03-24

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-03-25 07:49

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-03-28 10:02

**Review time:** 3 Days and 2 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The study looks like a systematic review, and thus if this is true, the authors should follow the preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses (PRISMA) and they should consider that in the title.

### **RESPONSE TO REVIEWER 02728252:**

Dear reviewer and Professor,

Thank you very much for your appreciation. We have taken it into consideration and modified our manuscript to answer your query.

You are in fact. We have reviewed our manuscript and all the article type's definition and our manuscript does not fulfill all systematic review criteria.

For example, Cochrane collaboration defines: "A systematic review is a high-level overview of primary research on a particular research question that tries to identify, select, synthesize and appraise all high-quality research evidence relevant to that question in order to answer it" and "A systematic review attempts to identify, appraise and synthesize all the empirical evidence that meets pre-specified eligibility criteria to answer a given research question. Researchers conducting systematic reviews use explicit methods aimed at minimizing bias, in order to produce more reliable findings that can be used to inform decision making".

We have employed some methodology of a systematic review but not all. For example, we have provided Eligibility criteria, Information sources, Search strategy, Selection process, Data collection process, etc.

But we have not performed, as examples, a deep study risk of bias assessment, we have not provided Effect measures and we have not performed a Synthesis of the published results and neither a meta-analysis of them nor we have not performed Certainty assessment.

So, we have not followed all the "preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses" (PRISMA) and we consider that the literature found is very heterogeneous and scant to perform this very deep analysis and we are not able to perform it in the time provided to answer this manuscript review. As we mention on the text, "Given the great variability in the study designs, anastomotic models, interventions (SCs, doses and vehicles) and outcome measures, we considered it impossible to perform a reliable meta-analysis, so we focused on describing the studies, their results and limitations, presenting a descriptive or narrative review."

That is the reason we have decided to request BPG editorial board to change our manuscript type from "systematic review" to "review", a type where our manuscript fits better.

We have changed and erased the mentions to "systematic" in the manuscript (pages 7 and 11) as you will be able to see.

Thank you very much for your wise commentary, we are sure that the corrected version is more scientifically precise.

Kind regards.