



# BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Stem Cells

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 12650

**Title:** Tooth-derived stem cells:update and perspectives

**Reviewer code:** 00504407

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2014-07-19 16:53

**Date reviewed:** 2014-08-19 17:16

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript, with the title "Tooth-derived stem cells: update and perspectives" present a topic that is relevant for the journal. It is well written, well-structures and gives a good overview of the topic. Yet, the manuscript needs to be revised based on at least the following minor comments: 1. Page 1, paragraph 1: The authors write: "...improve the current approaches in the medical field". Why not be more specific, and if possible, add a few examples. 2. Page 1, paragraph 2: "...maintain the tissue or repair it...". Maybe not wrong, but consider revising to improve language. 3. Page 1, paragraph 3: Mesenchymal with big letter M. Should be "mesenchymal". 4. Page 1, paragraph 3: "mesenchymal stem cells". Why not use the MSC abbreviation just introduced? 5. Page 3, paragraph2: Please explain "HA-TCP". 6. Page 3, paragraph 3 and more: Please consider to not abbreviating "cols.", I don't think it is a common abbreviation. 7. Page 4: The effect or intention with "Alizarin Red" staining ought to be explained or described. 8. Conclusion, first sentence: "...over these years". Please consider to revise and possibly be more specific. 9. Figure 1: The figure needs at least the explanations of the abbreviations.



# BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Stem Cells

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 12650

**Title:** Tooth-derived stem cells:update and perspectives

**Reviewer code:** 02446080

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2014-07-19 16:53

**Date reviewed:** 2014-09-05 00:01

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Please see comments (yellow highlighted) and corrections directly in the revised manuscript version attached(turn on Word track-changes function)



**ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Stem Cells

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 12650

**Title:** Tooth-derived stem cells:update and perspectives

**Reviewer code:** 00504632

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2014-07-19 16:53

**Date reviewed:** 2014-08-12 19:06

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] Existing	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good	[Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] No records	[ ] Rejection
[Y] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[ ] Existing	[Y] Major revision
		[ ] No records	

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Tooth-derived stem cells: update and perspectives This review manuscript describes the characteristics of different types of stem cells obtained from teeth. Major comments: -Although the manuscript provides a reasonable introduction to the various stem cell types that have been derived from teeth, it fails in critically comparing these cells. This is a bit disappointing, as a good critical comparison is very helpful indeed for those that study tooth-derived stem cells. -In total the manuscript is superficial and lacks depth. -The word ‘perspective’ in the title is an overstatement. ‘Further research is needed’ as a conclusion can hardly be considered a perspective. -The figure can be helpful but needs a proper legend. It should be made clear what is visualized here, with a proper orientation, and the abbreviations need to be explained. Particularly for those with limited knowledge on tooth morphology the figure is unclear without a proper legend. -The manuscript contains several mistakes: \* page 1 top: not all stem cells can differentiate to multiple cell types: as an example spermatogonial stem cells only differentiate to 1 cell type. \* page 1 middle: iPS cell are reprogrammed ‘normal cells’, not reprogrammed adult stem cells. \* page 1 middle it is stated that mesenchymal stem cells are ‘the most studies stem cells’. This is based on what? \*Abbreviations should be provided in the text, not in the paragraph headings. \* From table 2 it can be deduced that the various tooth derived stem cells have different origins/locations. It would be very helpful if this was better explained in the text. \* Table 1: blastocysts do not contain totipotent stem cells. Extraembryonic tissue is formed from trophectoderm while the inner cell mass can give rise to



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

pluripotent embryonic stem cells. No totipotent stem cells have yet be described. The zygote is totipotent, but it does not have self-renewal capacity and therefore is not a stem cell. - Apart from the numerous typos, the whole manuscript should be thoroughly edited for correct use of the English language.



# BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

## ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Stem Cells

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 12650

**Title:** Tooth-derived stem cells:update and perspectives

**Reviewer code:** 00727943

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2014-07-19 16:53

**Date reviewed:** 2014-09-11 14:37

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Whenever stem cells from different dental tissues are compared for their characteristics, if possible, it should be mentioned that the tissues were from the same donor or not.