Dear Editor,

We thank the reviewers and editorial team for taking their efforts to improve the article to increase its value for publication. Herewith we submit the revised version of the article addressing the reviewer's comments and the action taken for their valuable suggestions have been mentioned below.

Reviewer 1 comments	Authors Reply	Action Taken
The subject of this manuscript was novel and interesting. The reviewer found a few papers worth mentioning besides the ones cited, but given the scoup of this manuscript, their absence was of no concern.	Thanks for the encouraging comment	None
Reviewer 2 comments	**Authors Reply**	**Action Taken**
It is best to add what keywords and how to find the articles in the review	Thanks for the comment An electronic search was conducted until Dec 2022 including articles from January 2003 to December 2022 databases such as PubMed, Web of Science, Embase, and CNKI (China Knowledge Resource Integrated Database). The terms used for the search included: "mesenchymal stromal cell", "MSCs", "mandible", "long bone", "regenerative potential", "proliferation", and "regeneration". In this manuscript, we compared the proliferation and regenerative potential of mandible and long bones.	Added in the introduction section.
The data in Table 1 can be written by year.	Thanks for the comment	Rearranged in year wise for particular parameter as per the reviewer comment
The part with the same data in "Cell expression" of Table I may not be listed	Thanks for the comment	Cell expression section is removed as per the reviewer comment
Only F-MSCs is described in part "In vitro evidence in lineages of long bone-derived MSCs",and some other literature on long bone-derived MSCs can be added	Thanks for the comment There were no studies from other long bones derived MSCs to compare the regenerative potential. Hence, they were not included.	None

Is it possible to add the author's own views on the development direction of this field in "Authors Opinions".	Thanks for the comment	Included in author's opinion as recommended

Is it possible to add the author's own views on the development direction of this field in "Authors Opinions".