

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 12794

**Title:** Renal Stem Cell Reprogramming: Prospects in Regenerative Medicine

**Reviewer code:** 02596361

**Science editor:** Ling-Ling Wen

**Date sent for review:** 2014-07-26 22:57

**Date reviewed:** 2014-07-28 21:04

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"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input 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	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a very well written review which focuses on the hot topic that is iPSCs. Overall the quality of the review is high but it does lack detail in places and could be more critical rather than simply summarising. Major: Introduction - the authors identify 9 review papers that look at the identification of renal stem cells but then immediately jump into iPSC instead. I feel the introduction would be much stronger if a better justification for why iPSC rather than renal stem cells (other than just avoiding immunosuppressant drugs) was written. For instance, do those reviews show a lack of success in finding human renal stem cells? Are they rare in the tissue and therefore difficult to isolate or culture? The authors should also refer to how many cells are thought to be needed for a therapy as this will help but the low differentiation efficiencies into context for the reader. The authors should also acknowledge the work that is ongoing looking at the use of other stem cells (e.g. MSCs) to treat kidney diseases and make reference to any clinical trials ongoing or completed in this space. Again - taking this work into account, what is the justification for focussing on iPSCs? Forward thinking section : here the authors talk about several studies that have used small molecules but fail to mention what the reprogramming efficiencies were (or highlight that these were not determined). Given this is a key issue highlighted earlier in the text this is odd. General - the authors have not addressed/acknowledged the issue of cell quality - if the patient has an acutely or chronically damaged kidney, are these cells suitable for reprogramming? They have also not mentioned the issue of downstream processing which is integrally linked to the issue of low



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

differentiation/reprogramming efficiencies - ie do you need to isolate the successfully reprogrammed/differentiation cells and if so how and at the appropriate scale? Minor: Abstract - "stem cell therapy is a promising alternative" ...to what? Sentence is odd in this context. Introduction - bottom paragraph pg 1 is under-referenced. pg 4 "produced (evidenced by....". Bracket is never closed, sentence rambling. Throughout - it would be useful if the authors could make it clear when studies used human rather than e.g. mouse cells as this helps the reader identify the relevance of the work described. Reference list: this seems inconsistent as not all references have DOIs. Perhaps the editor could comment on whether or not this is an issue. Although well written the review is heavy going as it is mostly text with only 1 figure and a large number of abbreviations. More figures or tables could be helpful here.



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

### ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 12794

**Title:** Renal Stem Cell Reprogramming: Prospects in Regenerative Medicine

**Reviewer code:** 00503254

**Science editor:** Ling-Ling Wen

**Date sent for review:** 2014-07-26 22:57

**Date reviewed:** 2014-08-11 10:10

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input 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	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

None