

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_128803
Title of the Manuscript:	The Regulation of the Mesenchymal Stem Cells Derived Exosome via PTEN and P13K/Akt Pathway in Remodeling Soft Tissue Damage Following A Wide Excision of Fibrosarcoma : A Literature Review
Type of the Article	Short communication

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it explores the emerging role of MSC-derived exosomes in soft tissue regeneration after fibrosarcoma excision. It highlights the regulation of the PTEN and PI3K/Akt pathways as a promising therapeutic approach to reduce post-surgical complications and enhance patient recovery. The emphasis on exosome-based cell-free therapy offers a safer and more scalable alternative to traditional MSC treatments. This review serves as a foundation for advancing preclinical and clinical research in regenerative medicine.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is informative but slightly verbose. A more concise and impactful title could be: "The Role of MSC-Derived Exosomes in Soft Tissue Remodelling via the PTEN and PI3K/Akt Pathway Following Wide Fibrosarcoma Excision."	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is clear and provides a good overview of the manuscript. However, it could be improved by including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A brief mention of the PTEN/PI3K/Akt pathway's role in the mechanism of exosome function. Specific examples of MSC sources (e.g., bone marrow, adipose tissue) to add depth. A sentence highlighting the current limitations and the need for future research. 	
Is the manuscript scientifically correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically sound, providing relevant experimental evidence and detailed descriptions of MSC exosome functions. The discussion of the PTEN/PI3K/Akt pathway is well-supported and aligns with existing research. However: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greater emphasis on the differences in exosome efficacy based on MSC tissue sources would strengthen the review. Including more details about current limitations in clinical translation would balance the manuscript. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and relevant but could include a few more recent studies (2022–2024) to reflect the latest advancements in MSC-derived exosome research. Suggested additions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A study on "Tools and Techniques Used for the Development of Scaffold for Bone Tissue Regeneration: A Detailed Review" by M. Aijaz et.al. DOI.org/10.33263/BRIAC145.123 A review focusing on the scalability and manufacturing challenges of exosomes for therapeutic use. 	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but some sentences are overly long and require rephrasing for clarity and conciseness. Additionally: <p>Avoid redundancy in phrases like "fibrosarcoma is an aggressive form of soft tissue cancer, currently a major challenge in oncology."</p> <p>Ensure consistent use of terms like "PTEN/PI3K/Akt pathway" and avoid overgeneralizations.</p> <p>Suggested improvements:</p> <p>Simplify complex sentences without losing meaning.</p> <p>Remove typographical errors like "Fibrosarcoma" (should be "Fibrosarcoma") and "P13K" (should be "PI3K").</p>	
Optional/General comments	The inclusion of figures (e.g., pathways, MSC isolation schemes) is commendable, but captions should include more detail to make them self-explanatory. Consider discussing the potential limitations of exosome therapy, such as scalability, storage, and immune responses. A comparison with other regenerative approaches, like direct MSC therapy, would enrich the discussion and highlight the advantages of exosome-based therapy.	

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:	Moh Aijaz
Department, University & Country	Graphic Era Hill University, India