



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Translational Medicine

ESPS manuscript NO: 20826

Title: Pro- vs anti-stenotic capacities of type-I vs type-II human induced pluripotent-derived endothelial cells

Reviewer’s code: 00505755

Reviewer’s country: Japan

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-06-29 12:09

Date reviewed: 2015-07-29 10:51

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

General comments (1) The importance of the research and the significance of the research findings This research is important in terms of exploring the possibility of iPSC-derived endothelial cells in the application for the treatment of arteriostenosis. (2) The novelty and innovative nature of the research This is an innovative research describing that the allogenic iPSC-derived endothelial cell (anti-proliferative, type II) can be transplanted for the treatment of arteriostenosis. (3) The quality of the manuscript’s presentation and readability It is well written. (4) The ethics-related aspects of the research The risk of the experiment in terms of ethics seems to be low. Specific comments Title: It accurately reflects the major topic and contents of the study. Abstract: It appropriately describes about the content of the manuscript. Introduction: The differences between type I and II of EC may be more emphasized. Materials and Methods: The method for distinguishing type I and II may be described. Results: The results or some references should be shown to show NK cells are induced and immunoreaction by NK cells were blocked by administration of anti-AGM1 in page 12. The reason why anti-AGM1 administration significantly inhibited the arteriostenosis may be described in page



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>

13. The correlation between “WI+antiAMG1+transplantation (-)” and pro-stenosis capacity of type-I iPSCs should be examined in page 13. The difference between ESdECs at early passages (type-I) and type-II-converted cells should be described with passage numbers in page 14. References: The reference 1 has not been published yet, so it is difficult to determine whether ESdECs at early passages (type-II) and at late passages (type-I) show type conversion or not. Please check the reference citations in the manuscript carefully. Figure and Table: In figure 3B, the result of WI without anti-AGM1 administration may be presented. In figure 4D and E, the indication for type I and II in ESdEC experiments is needed.



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 Translational Medicine

ESPS manuscript NO: 20826

Title: Pro- vs anti-stenotic capacities of type-I vs type-II human induced pluripotent-derived endothelial cells

Reviewer's code: 02446219

Reviewer's country: Iran

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-06-29 12:09

Date reviewed: 2015-08-06 03:17

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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input 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 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 is about two types of vascular endothelial cells, which have anti and pro proliferative effect on vascular smooth muscle cells. The study is well-design and written. The point should be considered by the authors is that the introduction is too long and wordy. It is might be a good idea to shorten the introduction and abstract.