

Format for ANSWERING REVIEWERS

MAY 25, 2015

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: 2429-review.doc).

Title: The Use of Bone Marrow Derived Stem Cells in Trauma and Orthopaedics: a review of current concepts

Author: Pastides P, Welck M, Khan W

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 17040

The manuscript has been improved according to the suggestions of reviewers:

1 Format has been updated

2 Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the reviewer

Reviewer(1)

nice review. introduction needs more citations. i would like to see a paragraph for each section on mechanisms. if the mechanisms are not known speculation is fine. PLease avoid language of course or absolutely creating closed sentences

We thank the reviewer and have proceeded to polish the language. We believe that a section on mechanisms will be too brief to include, as this is a huge topic, worthy of a separate paper in its own right.

Reviewer (2)

The whole manuscript needs a thorough revision (evidenced by lacking periods and wrong abbreviations). In particular, the authors ought to consider the following minors: ?

Abstract: The authors use both the abbreviation and the full version of “bone marrow-derived stem cells”. ?

amended

Introduction, second paragraph: Please clarify or specify what is meant by “environment” and if possible, use a few good examples. ? Introduction, second paragraph: A lot of statements, but no references are used. Please consider to add references to improve the manuscript.

We thank the reviewer for the comment. This is merely the introductory section and only the second paragraph. As the reader reads the manuscript, each section is appropriately referenced and explained. We believe the term ‘environment’ does not need expansion; it is a self explanatory statement that the reader will certainly understand.



? Introduction, last paragraph: Please consider to add a reference or more to support the statement “The high incidence of such injuries highlights the need for novel, more effective treatments”. ?

This is referenced in the following paragraphs; this is merely a general statement in the introductory part of the paper that we believe the readers will agree with.

Rotator cuff section: It might help the reader and improve the manuscript by shortly adding an explanation of the “secondary rotator cuff...” sentence. ?

The sentence has been expanded

Rotator cuff section: MHC is not explained or written in full. ?

Explained

Rotator cuff section, second paragraph (and page 6): The abbreviation BDMSC is not explained (or do you mean BMDSC??) ?

Amended

Rotator cuff section, second paragraph: Please clarify what is meant by “similar beneficial outcome...”. ?

Amended

Rotator cuff section, third paragraph: Please be specific and clarify what is meant by “physiological dose of insulin”. ?

The authors of this paper actually used there study to determine the effects of various dosages of insulin and thus we cannot give specific dosages. The paper is clearly referenced and the reader could therefore obtain this paper if desired.

Rotator cuff section, 4th paragraph, second sentence: Revise the sentence.

Amended

Rotator cuff section, last paragraph, first sentence: Revise. ?

Amended

Tendons and ligaments section, second paragraph: Please clarify what is meant by “SCS”? ?

Amended

Tendons and ligaments section, third paragraph, second sentence: Why not use the “BMDSC” abbreviation? ?

Amended

Tendons and ligaments section, third paragraph: Please explain (write in full) “GDF-5”. ?

Amended

Cartilage section: The first sentence in the second paragraph seem to point to a previous sentence. Please clarify and/or revise. ?

Sentence removed

Cartilage section, second paragraph. The authors state that there “is a plethora of publications..”, but are only referring to a few. It would improve the statement (and content) by describing and using more references. ?

The reference points to a very recent review article on this topic. Once again, this represents a general statement and observation and expanding it to a reasonable degree would probably result in another paper.

Cartilage section, second paragraph, last sentences: The topic of “choice of scaffold” – please consider discussing this more in depth and not only mentioning it by examples. ?

The reviewer again raises a good point however we feel that this is beyond the scope of this paper and could be the subject of a subsequent article.

Meniscus section, second paragraph: Do all potential readers know what “collagen-GAG ...” is? Please consider to help the reader and explain the expression/abbreviation. ?

Amended

Meniscus section, third paragraph: The abbreviation BM-MS lack explanation. ?

Amended

Bone defects section: VEGF abbreviation – write in full first time. ?

Amended

Osseous non-unions section: Please explain “passage 1”

This was removed and represented a typo.

Reviewer (3)

Dear Author, The Paper must undergo a minor revision with respect to language to content.

We thank the reviewer and have proceeded to polish the language.

References and typesetting were corrected

Thank you again for publishing our manuscript in the *World Journal of Orthopedics*.

Sincerely yours,



Philip Pastides

ppastides@hotmail.com