

August 17, 2016

Dear World Journal of Stem Cell Editors,

I am pleased to submit the revised version of Manuscript 28283, "**Renal progenitors: roles in kidney disease and regeneration.**" We have proofread the article and made minor editorial changes, which are highlighted in grey. A response to the peer reviewers is attached here.

Sincerely,  
Dr. Rebecca A. Wingert

Reviewed by 00503294

Manuscript Number 28283  
Manuscript Title [Renal progenitors: roles in kidney disease and regeneration](#)  
Review Time 2016-07-15 21:27

Comments To Authors  
This is a review article dealing with recent advances in the role as well as characterization of renal cells progenitors in regeneration and kidney diseases. It also provides a clear pathophysiological description of molecules as well as genetics of renal progenitor's cells. Interestingly, the authors also discussed how the zebrafish could provide a unique experimental animal model for developing novel regenerative therapies.

Classification  
☐ Grade A (Excellent)  
☐ Grade B (Very good)  
☒ Grade C (Good)  
☐ Grade D (Fair)  
☐ Grade E (Poor)

Language evaluation  
☒ Grade A: priority publishing  
☐ Grade B: minor language polishing  
☐ Grade C: a great deal of language polishing  
☐ Grade D: rejected

Conclusion  
☒ Accept  
☐ High priority for publication  
☐ Rejection  
☐ Minor revision  
☐ Major revision

**[Dear Reviewer 00503294:](#)**

**[We appreciate the time spent critiquing our manuscript. We have made minor editorial changes to the text, which are highlighted in grey.](#)**

Reviewed by 02520738

Manuscript Number 28283  
Manuscript Title [Renal progenitors: roles in kidney disease and regeneration](#)  
Review Time 2016-07-04 23:24

Comments To Authors  
To: Lian-Sheng Ma, President and Company Editor-in-Chief Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited World Journal of Stem Cells Title: "Renal progenitors: roles in kidney disease and regeneration" Dear Editor, We have read through the manuscript and we think that this is a very interesting work. The paper is good an well written.

Classification  
☒ Grade A (Excellent)  
☐ Grade B (Very good)  
☐ Grade C (Good)  
☐ Grade D (Fair)  
☐ Grade E (Poor)

Language evaluation  
☒ Grade A: priority publishing  
☐ Grade B: minor language polishing  
☐ Grade C: a great deal of language polishing  
☐ Grade D: rejected

Conclusion  
☒ Accept  
☐ High priority for publication  
☐ Rejection  
☐ Minor revision  
☐ Major revision

---

**[Dear Reviewer 02520738:](#)**

**We appreciate the time spent critiquing our manuscript. We have made minor editorial changes to the text, which are highlighted in grey.**