

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 63311

**Title:** Xenogeneic stem cells transplantation: research progress and clinical prospects

**Reviewer's code:** 02524648

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Postdoctoral Fellow, Senior Researcher

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-01-27

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-01-29 10:18

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-02-08 21:54

**Review time:** 10 Days and 11 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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 checked="" 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
<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 their review titled “Xenogeneic stem cell(s) transplantation: research progress and clinical prospects”, Jiang and colleagues offer a succinct account of efforts that have been made to study the potential of stem cells to be used in xenotransplantation. Some comments to this work would be:

- Perhaps the use of the term “scholar” is not the most appropriate in this context, and it is continuously repeated. Other terms such as experts, clinicians, researchers, etc. could be used.
- Section (1): I have found the claim of rodents as promising source of commercial xenogeneic stem cells somewhat surprising. I have therefore looked through the available bibliography, as well as checked the references provided in the article. I have, however, failed to find evidence to support the claim of rodent cells being considered possible cell sources for their clinical use in transplantation protocols. Would the authors please care to provide some evidence to support this claim?
- In section (1): please clarify the expression “extensive cell origins”, regarding MSCs.
- Section (2), 2nd paragraph: When referring to Ding’s transplantation work, clarify “The results showed that human stem cells....” as “this type of human cells” (i.e. umbilical cord stroma-derived stem cells).
- Section (2.1): Please explain cellular desensitization, what it conveys.
- Section (2.2.): Please clarify the referral to cell chip in “Qiao et al. developed single-cell derived spheres of UCMSCs by combining a 3D culture with 2D arrayed patterns of single or multiple cells on one patch in the cell chip...”. - Raynald et al.... Please correct reference, as it does not correspond to the list of references.
- Section (3.1): Please correct “Matsunari created pancreatic pig embryos...” to “... apancreatic pig embryos...”