



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: office@baishideng.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Stem Cells*

Manuscript NO: 89301

Title: Recent progress in hair follicle stem cell markers and their regulatory roles

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06123381

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: N/A

Professional title: N/A

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-10-27

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-22 02:17

Reviewer performed review: 2023-12-04 10:44

Review time: 12 Days and 8 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" 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 Grade E: Do not publish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

Scientific significance of the conclusion in 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 scientific significance
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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

The manuscript undertakes a comprehensive review of diverse biomarkers linked to hair follicle stem cells (HFSCs), encompassing elucidations on their expression patterns and regulatory roles. However, the present iteration falls short of recommendation for acceptance. To elevate the overall quality of the manuscript, careful attention must be directed to the following key points: 1. Consider supplementing the detailed description of biomarker expression periods and locations with visual aids, such as figures or diagrams. These graphical representations can significantly augment reader comprehension by illustrating the diverse stages of hair follicle development and the roles played by various cell types. 2. Address formatting issues throughout the manuscript, including problems with reference format (line 52) and inconsistent punctuation formatting (lines 61, 89, 90, 91, etc.). Ensure meticulous adherence to the chosen citation style and maintain consistent formatting throughout the manuscript. 3. Rectify the non-uniform format of subtitles, ensuring consistency, and include the full name of the gene in all relevant cases for improved clarity. 4. Expand the discussion on future research directions within the field. Offer more detailed suggestions on

addressing identified limitations in subsequent studies, elucidating the path for future investigations. 5. Delve into how the studies under review stimulate authors to pursue further research. Identify lingering questions, propose experiments or investigations prompted by the findings, and underscore any unexplored aspects. 6. Explicitly outline the limitations of the reviewed studies and highlight potential biases introduced by specific methodologies. This transparency will contribute to a more robust and balanced interpretation of the findings. 7. Integrate a stronger emphasis on the clinical relevance of the reviewed studies. Discuss how these findings might impact future clinical approaches or therapies, providing a bridge between basic research and potential applications in a clinical setting. By addressing these points, the manuscript will not only strengthen its scientific rigor but also enhance its accessibility and potential impact within the scientific community. We appreciate the authors' valuable contribution to the field and look forward to a revised version that incorporates these suggestions.