

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 82793

**Title:** Advancements in adipose-derived stem cell therapy for skin fibrosis

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06469514

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-12-28

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-01-04 01:42

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-01-20 05:10

**Review time:** 16 Days and 3 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [ **Y** ] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

COMMENTS FOR MANUSCRIPT TITLE: ADIPOSE-DERIVED STEM CELL THERAPY

IN SKIN FIBROSIS (1) Is the manuscript important/innovative and why? In particular, does it contain new concepts, hypotheses, and/or mechanistic, diagnostic or therapeutic information, or does it represent a state-of-the-art review of the topic? This review topic is interesting, but manuscript is lack of depth in discussing the mechanism and the recent clinical updates. (2) Is the manuscript well, concisely, and coherently organized and presented? Not presented well enough.

1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Yes, but it does not reflect the type of article. The title should mention that the article is a review. 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Yes, but too short and some aspects were not mentioned in the abstract. The abstract is too short, less than 200 words. The keywords did not follow the guideline. 3 Key Words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Yes

5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? No 6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? This article explained the possible mechanism of fibrosis and ASC therapy from previous studies. 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or

relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? A section on updates on the clinical applications of ASCs therapy will be a good addition for this article to relate with the future direction. 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams, and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative, with labeling of figures using arrows, asterisks, etc, and are the legends adequate and accurately reflective of the images/illustrations shown? Fig 1 : the labels in the diagram are too small. 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? Not applicable.

10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Not applicable. 11 References. Does the manuscript appropriately cite the latest, important and authoritative references in the Introduction and Discussion sections? Yes Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? No 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? Not presented well enough. Need to be reviewed and edited/corrected before acceptance. 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to BPG's standards for manuscript type and the appropriate topically-relevant category, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. For (6) Letters to the Editor, the author(s) should have prepared the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting. Letters to the Editor will be critically evaluated and only letters with new important original or complementary information should be considered for publication. A Letter to the Editor that only recapitulates information published in the article(s) and states that more



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

studies are needed is not acceptable? Corresponding author: 2 names given, did not follow author's guideline Although it is a good attempt to review on the interesting topic, the manuscript seems generally did not conform with the author's guideline. This include the text formatting, font type and font case used and a many more mistakes that have been carelessly overlooked including the references section and some spellings. The whole manuscript is also too short for a normal review article. This article may be considered as a mini review. 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? Yes.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 82793

**Title:** Advancements in adipose-derived stem cell therapy for skin fibrosis

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05040484

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor, Doctor, Professor, Research Scientist

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-12-28

**Reviewer chosen by:** Yu-Lu Chen

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-02-27 07:40

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-03-07 18:38

**Review time:** 8 Days and 10 Hours

Scientific quality	<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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<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 checked="" 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

This is an interesting overview, but all abbreviations should be spelled out the first time they appear in the main body of the manuscript, even if they've already been spelled out in the abstract.