

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Stem Cells

**Manuscript NO:** 54968

**Title:** Stem cell-based therapies for fertility preservation in males: Current status and future prospects

**Reviewer's code:** 04150708

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-02-26

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-02-27 14:25

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-03-05 12:31

**Review time:** 6 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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 checked="" 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 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



**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

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This manuscript reviews the research progress on the use of stem cells as a male fertility preservation technique. The relationship of the different cells involved in spermatogenesis is addressed to understand the cross talk among them, so scientists can improve tissue culture techniques to differentiate mature spermatozoa, using both 2D and 3D tissue cultures. A few comments to be taken into account to improve the quality of the manuscript.

1. Abstract section. A final conclusion is missing.
2. Introduction section. The sentence "tumour have become younger", This sentence can be improved as: patients with tumors ...
3. Current strategies for male fertility preservation section. The two first paragraphs start by the same sentence "At present the most acceptable...". Change one of them so not be repetitive.
4. Testicular organoid section. At the end of paragraph number 2 meiosis is repeated twice, and I am pretty sure the authors mean "... decreasing germ cells after mitosis and meiosis". Also, in the 5th paragraph PLGA description is full of squares, format error.
5. The role of other stem cells in male fertility preservation. First paragraph after referring to references 142-145 when saying "Therefore the question of whether stem cells cultured with SSCs can produce useful...", do you think stem cells should be replaced by MSCs?
6. The role of other stem cells in male fertility preservation. In the fourth line, EVs should be defined.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Stem Cells

**Manuscript NO:** 54968

**Title:** Stem cell-based therapies for fertility preservation in males: Current status and future prospects

**Reviewer's code:** 02595776

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** South Korea

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-02-26

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jin-Zhou Tang (Quit in 2020)

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-04-01 07:11

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-04-01 09:07

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<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 checked="" 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 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**

As review paper, it seems acceptable for publication. However, the authors are encouraged to provide more illustration for the readership.