

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 80169

Title: Prospects for the use of olfactory mucosa cells in four-dimensional (4D) bioprinting for the treatment of spinal cord injuries

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06080724

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MBBS

Professional title: N/A

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Russia

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-19

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-03 06:20

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-11 13:27

Review time: 8 Days and 7 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	 [] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No



Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This review discussed the possibility of olfactory mucosa cells and neurotrophic factors in 4D bioprinting to create transplants for the transplant-mediated repair of the damaged area of the spinal cord. Overall, this is a well-written manuscript and I only have a few minor comments. 1.What are the limitations of olfactory mucosa cells for transplantation that deserve attention? Feasibility and safety of cell-based treatments should also be discussed. 2.It may help to enhance logic by briefly introducing the types of olfactory mucosa cells and exogenous neurotrophin therapy before describing them (e.g. using graphics or tables).



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 80169

Title: Prospects for the use of olfactory mucosa cells in four-dimensional (4D) bioprinting for the treatment of spinal cord injuries

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05489967

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: Russia

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-19

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-27 14:55

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-30 22:30

Review time: 3 Days and 7 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	 [] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors, The authors wrote a minireview about the olfactory mucosa cells in a 4D bioprinting to treat spinal cord injuries. After summarizing the cells used to treat the spinal cord injuries, the authors explain how 3D printing mainly and 4D printing can improve the treatment of the spinal cord with stem cells. I have some comments about the manuscript: Major: - The title focused on the 4D bioprinting and it is barely reported in the manuscript. I suggest also mentioning the 3D in the title (major part of the manuscript) and also to shorten the title because only 18 words are allowed. - References are not in the right format. Reference [62] is in the right format. - Each part should be numbered with 1, 1.1 ... - A figure/graph will help the readers to understand the minireview subject. - In the "exogenous neurotrophins Therapy" the authors should mention in 2-3 sentences the potential harmful long term effect of using viruses for gene therapies. Minor: - Injection rather than "by their direct introduction".

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 80169

Title: Prospects for the use of olfactory mucosa cells in bioprinting for the treatment of spinal cord injuries

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05489967

Position: Peer Reviewer



Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: Russia

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-19

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-02 18:42

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-02 23:15

Review time: 4 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	 [] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors, Thank you for revising the manuscript. I have minors revisions before to accept the manuscript for publication: - Part 3.3 and part 4.4 should be part 3 and part 4. - Figure 1 was already published. If it is necessary, the authors should request the permission to Bull Exp Biol Med Journal to publish again the figure. Sincerely,