

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Stem Cells

ESPS manuscript NO: 12984

Title: Fetal Versus Adult Mesenchymal Stem Cells Achieve Greater Gene Expression, but Less Osteoinduction

Reviewer code: 00291404

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-07-31 15:59

Date reviewed: 2014-08-05 23:08

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have asked some interesting questions and they have compared the fetal versus adult MSCs for their ability to express transgenes via viral and non-viral vectors, and their differentiation capability. It is a very good study. Conclusions are supported by their data. However, there is a major problem with their data presentation, thus a major revision (rewriting the Results section) is needed. Major critic: The Results section was very, very poorly written. The discussion of data and the order of data presentation do not go hand-in-hand. (1). Page 12. Figure 2 I-L was cited before Fig. 2 A-H. (2). There is only one panel in Figure 3, not figure 3 A and B as cited on page 12. (3). Figure 4. They started by discussing Fig. 4E, then Fig. 4D, and never talked about Fig. 4 A-C, F-H. (4). Fig. 7A-B data have never been discussed. (5). The tables are not presented in order. It was cited in the order of Table, 1, 3, 4, and then 2. One of the very basic roles in presentation of data is to follow the order. Please spend some major effort to rewrite the results section. Minor points: (1). pcDNA3-emGFP or pcDNA3-eGFP? It seems to be pcDNA3-eGFP, unless you have used pcDNA6.2/EmGFP (created only recently by a company). (2). Page 13, line 3. What are efMSCs and eaMSCs? They have not been defined.