



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Stem Cells

Manuscript NO: 55126

Title: Human mesenchymal stem cells derived from umbilical cord and bone marrow exert immunomodulatory effects in different mechanisms

Reviewer's code: 03285323

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2020-03-20

Reviewer chosen by: Jie Wang (Quit in 2020)

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-03-24 17:45

Reviewer performed review: 2020-03-29 07:50

Review time: 4 Days and 14 Hours

Scientific quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[] Yes [] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have been investigated the difference in mechanisms of the immunosuppressive effects of umbilical cord-derived mesenchymal stem cells (UC-MSCs) and bone marrow-derived MSCs (BM-MSCs). They have concluded that UC-MSCs and BM-MSCs exhibit similar immunosuppression properties in different mechanisms, and UC-MSCs have potentials to substitute BM-MSCs as cell therapy products. In generally, this is a well-planned and -conducted study which would contribute the literature. However, I would like to make some suggestions which those are: i) background could be concise, instead some data could be provided in Abstract; ii) the sentence of “We found that UC-MSCs may be successful alternatives to BM-MSCs for GVHD treatment” at the end of Introduction is inappropriate, because it is a conclusion statement; iii) giving general information in Results section such as “One function of MSCs is to differentiate into osteoblasts, chondrocytes, or adipocytes[20]” is inappropriate , which could be provided in Methods and Discussion; iv) repetitions of figures within paragraph in Discussion are inappropriate.