



ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Stem Cells

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8887

Title: Umbilical Cord Fibroblasts: Could They Be Considered Mesenchymal Stem Cells?

Reviewer code: 00506590

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2014-01-11 13:48

Date reviewed: 2014-01-22 23:38

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	language polishing	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In general the mini review is interesting and contributes with specific relevant information in the area that I think it will be appreciated by other researchers. My only suggestion is to add a table that comparing BM versus UC fibroblast main characteristics.



ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Stem Cells

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8887

Title: Umbilical Cord Fibroblasts: Could They Be Considered Mesenchymal Stem Cells?

Reviewer code: 00609371

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2014-01-11 13:48

Date reviewed: 2014-02-11 10:56

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors briefly reviewed the confusing recent literatures about the UC-MSc, especially about their immunophenotype, gene expression profile, and differentiation potential, comparing with BM-MSc. The authors also discussed the potential underlying reasons for the confusion, and the future directions for the field. The review is concise, timely and valuable, but could be better if the language had been polished by a native English speaker. Also, I suggest the authors take some time to summarize the major differences and the similarities of UC-MSc and BM-MSc into a single table, so that the readers can recognize and understand the points easily. I noticed an obvious typos “Nestin-GFP reporter mouse”