

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 32417

**Title:** Fifteen years of bone marrow mononuclear cell therapy in acute myocardial infarction

**Reviewer's code:** 00504835

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-01-10 12:11

**Date reviewed:** 2017-01-12 02:43

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This short review by Micheu and Dorobantu summarized clinical trials of bone marrow mononuclear cells for treatment of AMI. The writing is clear with adequate comments of individual trials. However, since the focus of the review is on the use of bone marrow mononuclear cells, the title of the review should be "Fifteen years of bone marrow mononuclear cell therapy in acute myocardial infarction". If the authors choose to use the title with "stem cell", they should also include a review of mesenchymal stem cell trials.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 32417

**Title:** Fifteen years of bone marrow mononuclear cell therapy in acute myocardial infarction

**Reviewer's code:** 02446041

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-01-10 12:11

**Date reviewed:** 2017-01-24 07:48

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ Y ] Grade A: Excellent	[ Y ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ Y ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ Y ] No	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	[ ] Major revision
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[ Y ] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Comment The manuscript attempts to overview "Fifteen years of bone marrow stem cell therapy in acute myocardial infarction" and to highlight the good, the bad, and the future. They can improve the logic flow by following previous reviews, such as "Stem cell engineering for treatment of heart diseases: potentials and challenges" (Cell Biol Int. 2009 Mar;33(3):255-67) and "Curr Stem Cell Res Ther. 2012 Jan;7(1):2-14." They need to address the following specific points. Specific comment: 1) Abstract: It's written like introduction. It should be written to cover all materials as reflected by their title: "Fifteen years of bone marrow stem cell therapy in acute myocardial infarction" 2) Abstract, Core tip, and Introduction show the identical sentences - I'd prefer to re-phrase for better flow of logic - so annoy to read the identical sentences. 3) Core tip: "this effervescent domain" - what's that domain? Some elaboration is needed. 4) Page 5: "Noteworthy, the timing of cell delivery after AML, the quantity and quality of transplanted cells, as well as cell handling varied greatly, so is no wonder why apparently similar studies had different results." Some details should be discussed, such as what's the timing? How do you measure up the timing? How to execute? 5) The section



## 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>

---

"HALLMARK CLINICAL TRIALS" should be given a summary to name those hallmarks, preferred as Table or list format. 6) Page 9: Section "META-ANALYSIS" - what's the conclusion? 7) Page 11: "He's papers have been comprehensively analyzed by Francis and colleagues who identified and exposed a series of discrepancies and contradictions" - It should be "His" 8) Page 11: "Draw backs" should list all not just one case. 9) Page 12: "we chose to include them in our review in order to provide the reader with an accurate depiction of stem cell therapy in AMI." What do the authors refer to as "an accurate depiction of stem cell therapy in AMI?" 10) The statement "A substantial knowledge has been gained in the past 15 years since the first bone marrow stem cells transplantation have been performed in a patient with acute myocardial infarction," - it'll be much better to give a time line chart.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 32417

**Title:** Fifteen years of bone marrow mononuclear cell therapy in acute myocardial infarction

**Reviewer's code:** 02446202

**Reviewer's country:** India

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-01-10 12:11

**Date reviewed:** 2017-02-03 12:46

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 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 checked="" 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 topic is well selected and the analysis done is quite appreciable. The authors have made a good review to summarize the advances in the area of myocardial infarction. It gives an entire summary of development in this area of unmet medical need using stem cells.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 32417

**Title:** Fifteen years of bone marrow mononuclear cell therapy in acute myocardial infarction

**Reviewer's code:** 03414664

**Reviewer's country:** Mexico

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-01-10 12:11

**Date reviewed:** 2017-01-28 06:47

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 checked="" 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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript entitled: Fifteen years of bone marrow stem cell therapy in acute myocardial infarction, by Micheu MM et al. intended to review the course of bone marrow stem cell therapy, focusing on what have we learned on stem cells transplant, specifically in acute myocardial infarction (AMI) and also how can we properly use the knowledge gained. The manuscript lacks the analytical discussion that they intended to achieve at the beginning. The authors mentioned superficially what transplanted stem cells do for the sake of myocyte survival. The analysis of "Hallmark clinical trials" is very limited and is not enough to justify the title of the manuscript. The paper fails to clearly show how can we properly use the knowledge obtained.