

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Stem Cells

ESPS manuscript NO: 16914

Title: Enhancing endothelial progenitor cell for clinical use

Reviewer's code: 00504772

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-02-04 15:07

Date reviewed: 2015-02-11 12:46

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors reviewed EPC markers, contrives about EPC definition, changes of EPC in cardiovascular disease and potential use of EPCs in therapies. It is a very good review. I have a couple of suggestions about the article structure. 1. Authors should add an abstract at the beginning to describe the purpose of this review. 2. Authors should add a summary paragraph to summarize what have been reviewed in this article.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Stem Cells

ESPS manuscript NO: 16914

Title: Enhancing endothelial progenitor cell for clinical use

Reviewer's code: 02494908

Reviewer's country: Portugal

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-02-04 15:07

Date reviewed: 2015-03-13 03:03

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

No further comments. Congrats