



JOURNAL EDITOR-IN-CHIEF’S REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Stem Cells

Manuscript NO: 85722

Title: Multiomics reveal human umbilical cord mesenchymal stem cells improving acute lung injury via the lung-gut axis

Journal Editor-in-Chief (Associate Editor): Shengwen Calvin Li

Country/Territory: United States

Editorial Director: Jia-Ping Yan

Date accepted review: 2023-08-23 17:19

Date reviewed: 2023-08-23 17:20

Review time: 1 Hour

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair		<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

JOURNAL EDITOR-IN-CHIEF (ASSOCIATE EDITOR) COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Specific comments: 1) The current version of the title is neither logical nor captured about the data sets, as Reviewer 3 pointed out. 2) Page 38: “Figure 3 Human umbilical cord mesenchymal stem cells improve histopathology, inflammation, and endothelial barrier integrity of the ileum in acute lung injury mice.” Why did they use human UC MSCs in mouse models without using any immune suppression? What was the immune profiling they assessed? 3) Pages 39-40: Figure 4, all panels A - F, the images and text are blurry. A 1200 dpi resolution should be used. 4) Page 54, Fig 10: The right half of the images are blurry, and A 1200 dpi resolution should be used. 5) Page 7: “The purity of HUC-MSCs was assessed by immunofluorescence and was typically greater than 90%.” – How could they evaluate hHU-MSC by immunofluorescence? They need to follow the international standards of MSCs panel biomarkers. What is their definition of hHU-MSCs? Fig 2 is not sufficient. 6) Page 7: “A total of 48 6-8-wk-old male 7BL/6 mice were purchased from Beijing.” Page 8:” The random



**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

number method was used to divide mice into four groups, namely, sham, sham + MSCs, LPS, and LPS + MSCs groups, with 18 mice in each group. The 36 randomly selected mice were intraperitoneally injected with 100 mL of LPS (10 mg/kg) to induce ALI[7], and sham mice were administered 100 mL of 0.9% NaCl as controls.” Reviewer #1: 1. In the abstract section, The number of mice was written as “ 7BL/6 mice were randomly divided into four groups (each group has12 rats) Page 3: “METHODS, 7BL/6 mice were randomly divided into four groups (18 rats per group).” Comment: $18 \times 4 = 72$ mice. Why did they state a total of 48 mice? 18 rats? , 7BL/6 mice? Why did they state a total of 18 mice per group? Any consideration of statistical power? 7) English grammar errors crawl across pages, manifested in neither logical nor cohesive. E.g., “. Looking forward to it meeting your requirements. (Page 1) (page 5 of the Rebuttal) 8) Page 8: “After 6 h, half of the ALI mice and half of the sham mice were given 0.5 mL of phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) containing HUC-MSCs (2×10^6 cells/mL) by intraperitoneal injections[24]” (page 8). This statement contradicts their abstract, which states that “After 6 h, mice were intervened with 0.5 mL phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) containing 1×10^6 HUC-MSCs by intraperitoneal injection” (page 3). 9) Reviewer 1, point #3: “In materials and methods: “The three mice in each group were randomly taken.” The author’s rebuttal was insufficient because they used 18 mice per group. 10) “Non-Native Speakers of English Editing Certificate” contains a typo: acute lung injur” – not injur but injury.