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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Qingqing Liang and Lei Liu uncovered vascular endothelial cells in stem cell to be relevant in permeability, angiogenesis, blood pressure regulation, immunity, and pathological development, such as atherosclerosis and malignant tumor. The manuscript is of interest. Point to be considered: 1) The rationale of why the authors came up with this review. 2) What is the information that is not exactly available that motivated the authors to come up with this information. What are the current caveats and how do the authors highlight the current research in answering them? If not they need to address in future directions. 3) This reviewer personally misses some important consequences of the data reviewed by the authors, especially in the oncology field: VEGF receptors play a pivotal role in cancer, indeed, neo-angiogenesis constitutes a crucial event for cancer progression (i.e. For prostate cancer (PCa), abundant angiogenic signalling has been associated with aggressive courses of disease). Specifically, VEGFR2, which is one of the main therapeutic targets of tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKI), was reported to be upregulated in aggressive PCa. While TKI-based regimens do not appear promising for unselected PCa patients at first sight, distinct patient subgroups could benefit from such a treatment (please refer to PMID: 32131507 and expand accordingly). 4) Does this role of endothelial cells in angiogenesis in a tumor micro-environment involve hypoxia? Since hypoxia is a key factor for angiogenesis, the authors need to substantiate. 5) The authors need to come up with a table to show the role of endothelial cells as Checkpoint For Immunological Patrolling in solid and hematological cancers to highlight their exact role in light of the stem cell role. 6) The authors need to highlight what new information the review is providing to enhance the research in progress.
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The authors have clarified several of the questions I raised in my previous review. Most
of the major problems have been addressed by this revision