

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_116581
Title of the Manuscript:	Overview of Cellular Therapy: Reshaping the Wound in Diabetic Foot Ulcer
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. While the paper provides a broad overview, it lacks specificity in certain areas. For example, it would benefit from a more detailed discussion of the comparative effectiveness of stem cells from different sources. In addition, the paper does not address the specific types of stem cells (e.g., mesenchymal stem cells, hematopoietic stem cells) and their unique properties that may be relevant to their application in DFU. I recommend that the authors consider only the mechanisms and effects of cellular monotherapy [https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35476187/]. 2. The paper mentions the use of stem cell therapy by various medical groups worldwide, but does not provide a critical assessment of the available evidence. A more rigorous review of clinical trials, including their results, limitations, and the level of evidence available, would strengthen the paper's conclusions. 3. Any discussion of stem cell therapy must address safety and ethical considerations, which are conspicuously absent from this review. Potential risks such as tumorigenicity, immune rejection, are critical issues that need to be discussed to provide a balanced view of the potential of stem cell therapy in the treatment of DFUs [https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36393919/] [https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35884812/]. 4. Unfortunately, the effects of cell therapy alone may not lead to successful outcomes [https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35087716/] [https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36524153/], primarily due to the development of adverse events, side effects, or complications. In other cases, this may be due to stimulation of "senescent drift" phenomena in affected tissues if cell processing was compromised. I recommend that authors disclose this point in more detail. 5. Abstract: "Fat or Umbilical cord has shown that stem cells have anti-inflammatory properties and immunomodulatory properties that can be beneficial in angiogenesis, cartilage synthesis and reshape the wounds." - The "and" is superfluous in the original sentence. What does cartilage have to do with it? The abstract needs to be rewritten carefully and double-checked. 6. Figure 2 looks primitive and should be redrawn. 7, Conclusions seem advanced and promising in cell therapy applications and should be rewritten with a more comprehensive approach that considers all the drawbacks and risks of cell therapy. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The abstract needs to be rewritten carefully and double-checked.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The paper under review provides a comprehensive overview of the potential benefits of stem cell therapy in the treatment of diabetic foot ulcers (DFU), a complex and serious complication of diabetes that can significantly impact patients' quality of life and lead to further health complications. The focus is on how these cells can promote wound healing through mechanisms such as angiogenesis, epithelization and extracellular matrix remodeling. However, the paper should be rewritten and additionally double-checked.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ilya Klabukov
Department, University & Country	National Medical Research Radiological Center, Russia