



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Methodology*

**Manuscript NO:** 83250

**Title:** Is Mandible derived MSCs superior in proliferation and regeneration to long bone-derived MSCs?

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05910019

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-01-14

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-01-16 02:53

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-01-25 07:24

**Review time:** 9 Days and 4 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input 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**

In the manuscript titled Is Mandible derived MSCs superior in proliferation and regeneration to long bone-derived MSCs, Madhan Jeyaraman et al performed mandible derived MSCs, long bone-derived MSCs and their characteristics respectively and demonstrated a higher rate of proliferation and high osteogenic potential for M-MSCs as compared to long-bones MSCs. This study are valuable for the understanding of mandible derived MSCs and long bone-derived MSCs and their advantages and limitations in order to facilitate the selection of appropriate BMSCs for bone defect repair and regeneration. However, This article only compares the proliferation and regeneration of mandible derived MSCs and long bone-derived MSCs, without contrasting their mechanisms. Therefore, minor revision has to be done before this manuscript could be accepted for publication in the World Journal of Methodology. My detailed comments are as follows: (1) It is best to add what keywords and how to find the articles in the review. (2) The data in Table 1 can be written by year. (3) The part with the same data in "Cell expression" of Table I may not be listed. (4) Only F-MSCs is described in part "In vitro evidence in lineages of long bone-derived MSCs", and some other literature on long bone-derived MSCs can be added. (5) Is it possible to add the author's own views on the development direction of this field in "Authors Opinions".



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Methodology*

**Manuscript NO:** 83250

**Title:** Is Mandible derived MSCs superior in proliferation and regeneration to long bone-derived MSCs?

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06490371

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-01-14

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-01-18 19:14

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-01-27 17:34

**Review time:** 8 Days and 22 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

<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 subject of this manuscript was novel and interesting. The reviewer found a few papers worth mentioning besides the ones cited, but given the scoup of this manuscript, their absence was of no concern.