

Dear Editors-in-Chief of World Journal of Stem Cells,

First of all, I would like to thank for informing me that this manuscript is conditionally accepted for publication in World Journal of Stem Cells once I have made some essential revisions as suggested by the Reviewers and Science editor. I would also like to thank the Reviewers and Science editor for their valuable comments and suggestions. I have addressed the Reviewers and Science editor's comments in this letter and revised the manuscript accordingly.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Have a nice day.

Yours sincerely,

Chee-Yin Wong (Corresponding author)

Reviewer #1

Specific Comments to Authors:

The title matches what's mentioned inside and a comprehensive analysis of the topic has been provided in this review. The abstract summarizes the work been presented in the article. The key words are appropriate. Latest references have been cited and an up-to-date literature review has been done. The manuscript is well organized and well presented and covers the aspects in detail. I suggest, some references from Decoppi and Perin et al can be added mentioning Amniotic fluid stem cells differentiation towards nephron progenitors

Reply from author:

Thank you very much for your suggestion to include some amniotic fluid stem cell findings from De Coppi et al. and Perin et al. in kidney diseases in my manuscript. In this revised manuscript, I have added one Perin et al. article. This article demonstrated injection of amniotic fluid stem cells in mice has delays renal fibrosis progression (citation #127). However, I did not add any article from De Coppi et al. I know that De Coppi is an expert in amniotic fluid stem cells and he published numerous amniotic fluid stem cells-related articles. However, I cannot find any original research article on the renal topic, even though he published few review articles on the amniotic fluid stem cell's potential on kidney diseases.

Reviewer #2

Specific Comments to Authors:

the manuscript summarises the current stem cell-based therapeutic approaches to treat kidney diseases, including the various cell sources, in animal models or in vitro studies. challenges were also described. The manuscript is well written, however, a serious concern is the high %

of plagiarism (above 30%) when checked on turnitin. The author should minimize similarities to minimum. In the Introduction section: in treating cardiac, neural,renal; this present article reviews stem cell-based (delete on) In the section 'Induced pluripotent stem cells': -transplantation of iPSCS cells in a murine (delete the word cells). -tang et al. demonstrated that iPSCs-derived from conditioned medium !!! this is not clear at all!! it should be conditioned medium from iPSCs not the opposite!!!!!!! mention the clinical trial number in the manuscript as you did in the table.

Reply from author:

Thank you very much for your high % of plagiarism concerns and suggestions.

- (1) I understand that World Journal of Stem Cells is using CrossCheck to check the plagiarism. As I unable accessed to CrossCheck, I did check my first version of my manuscript with Turinitin before I submit the manuscript, my score was less than 30%, I am not sure why my result was not same with you. I need to mention that, in my Turinitin check, I have removed my references and table. As you know, all references indeed will appear in other resources. Plagiarism on references should not be counted. Meanwhile, for the table, the data are presented in point forms, only key words or main findings were written. In this situation, the descriptions of the findings or specific terms cannot be changed or rephrased. Therefore, plagiarism on my table should not be counted too.
- (2) I have deleted the words 'on' and 'cells' as you have mentioned.
- (3) I have also corrected the sentence to "Tarng *et al.* demonstrated that iPSCs-derived conditioned medium attenuated AKI...".
- (4) A new sentence stating the number of clinical trials using stem cell-based therapy to treat kidney diseases was added into the manuscript (First paragraph of subheading: Advancing clinical trials of stem cells for kidney disease).

Reviewer #3

Specific Comments to Authors:

The authors have drafted a very good article which indeed summarizes the current stem cell-based therapy approaches to treat kidney diseases in the experimental models and in addition they reported outcomes and findings from human clinical trials. The following minor comments will improve the manuscript editing 1. Authors should flow the Journal style specifically in the references' section. 2. Minor English polishing is required. 3. Adding a representative figure for kidney histological structure will be of value to the unspecialized reader. 4. Adding a flow chart representing the different types of regeneration possible using different types of stem cells or their conditioned media is recommended.

Reply from author:

Thank you very much for your comments and suggestion.

- (1) I have changed the reference style according to the journal format.
- (2) I have also re-read the manuscript carefully to improve the language.
- (3) Kidney histological structure, and

- (4) Flow chart representing the different types of stem cell explored for their regeneration potential were added into manuscript.

Science editor's comments:

Issues raised: (1) The “Author Contributions” section is missing. Please provide the author contributions; and (2) PMID and DOI numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout.

Reply from author:

Thank you for your comments. I have changed accordingly..

- (1) Author contributions were added into manuscript.
- (2) The format of reference was changed according to Journal style, PMID and DOI were added for all references. All authors for each reference were list entirely.

The authors did not respond to the plagiarism concerns regarding their manuscript. After deleting all references and table info as suggested by the authors, the plagiarism is still unacceptable at 23%.

The reviewer raised that After deleting all references and table info as suggested by the authors, the plagiarism is still unacceptable at 23%. However, the crosscheck showed the similarity is qualified. You can ignore the problem.