

Reviewer Assessment

Open Access

Jan Jeroen Vranckx* and Margot Den Hondt

Tissue engineering and surgery: from translational studies to human trials

DOI 10.1515/iss-2017-0011

Received February 6, 2017; accepted May 16, 2017

*Corresponding author: Jan Jeroen Vranckx,

Department of Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, KU Leuven University Hospitals, 49 Herestraat, B-3000 Leuven, Belgium,
E-mail: Jan.vranckx@uzleuven.be

Reviewers' Comments to Original Submission

Reviewer 1: anonymous

Mar 19, 2017

Reviewer Recommendation Term:	Accept with Minor Revision
Overall Reviewer Manuscript Rating:	N/A
Custom Review Questions	Response
Is the subject area appropriate for you?	4
Does the title clearly reflect the paper's content?	4
Does the abstract clearly reflect the paper's content?	4
Do the keywords clearly reflect the paper's content?	4
Does the introduction present the problem clearly?	4
Are the results/conclusions justified?	4
How comprehensive and up-to-date is the subject matter presented?	4
How adequate is the data presentation?	4
Are units and terminology used correctly?	4
Is the number of cases adequate?	N/A
Are the experimental methods/clinical studies adequate?	N/A
Is the length appropriate in relation to the content?	3
Does the reader get new insights from the article?	4
Please rate the practical significance.	3
Please rate the accuracy of methods.	N/A
Please rate the statistical evaluation and quality control.	N/A
Please rate the appropriateness of the figures and tables.	3
Please rate the appropriateness of the references.	4
Please evaluate the writing style and use of language.	4
Please judge the overall scientific quality of the manuscript.	5 - High/Yes
Are you willing to review the revision of this manuscript?	Yes

Comments to Authors:

Some small corrections in diction or grammar.

Reviewer 2: anonymous

Apr 10, 2017

Reviewer Recommendation Term:	Revise with Major Modification
Overall Reviewer Manuscript Rating:	50
Custom Review Questions	Response
Is the subject area appropriate for you?	3
Does the title clearly reflect the paper's content?	3
Does the abstract clearly reflect the paper's content?	4
Do the keywords clearly reflect the paper's content?	5 - High/Yes
Does the introduction present the problem clearly?	3
Are the results/conclusions justified?	3
How comprehensive and up-to-date is the subject matter presented?	4
How adequate is the data presentation?	3
Are units and terminology used correctly?	4
Is the number of cases adequate?	N/A
Are the experimental methods/clinical studies adequate?	N/A
Is the length appropriate in relation to the content?	2
Does the reader get new insights from the article?	3
Please rate the practical significance.	4
Please rate the accuracy of methods.	N/A
Please rate the statistical evaluation and quality control.	N/A
Please rate the appropriateness of the figures and tables.	3
Please rate the appropriateness of the references.	1 - Low/No
Please evaluate the writing style and use of language.	3
Please judge the overall scientific quality of the manuscript.	3
Are you willing to review the revision of this manuscript?	Yes

Comments to Authors:

Tissue Engineering strategies for surgery; by creeping substitution

The authors review the recent developments in the field of Tissue engineering. The review was unfortunately provided to the reviewer without a list of references so that an acceptance is not possible at this stage.

The review is quite lengthy and in parts repetitive as parts of the specialized section describing the approaches to different tissue types are already discussed in the first part of the manuscript.

Some crucial contributions to the field seem to be missing, e.g. the developments in cardiac tissue engineering pioneered by Wayne Morrison or the first-in-human trials regarding the clinical application of tissue engineered cartilage by Ivan Martin and coworkers.

The figure quality is relatively low and needs to be improved.

Page 11, last sentence of the first paragraph requires citations. What does (CFR infra) stand for?

Authors' Response to Reviewer Comments

May 03, 2017

Reviewer 1:

Required changes were made in the tekst.

A copy of the manuscript with all changes still visible was added for further convenience.

Reviewer 2:

The manuscript has been substantially shortened.

The reference list is once more added as well as the refs of Wayne Morisson et al. and Martin et al. The work of both authors was briefly explained into the manuscript.

Cfr infra: “conferatur infra”: “see below/further”

The resolution of the pictures was enhanced.

Sincerely Yours

Reviewers' Comments to Revision

Reviewer 1: anonymous

May 15, 2017

Reviewer Recommendation Term:	Accept
Overall Reviewer Manuscript Rating:	70
Custom Review Questions	Response
Is the subject area appropriate for you?	3
Does the title clearly reflect the paper's content?	4
Does the abstract clearly reflect the paper's content?	4
Do the keywords clearly reflect the paper's content?	4
Does the introduction present the problem clearly?	4
Are the results/conclusions justified?	3
How comprehensive and up-to-date is the subject matter presented?	3
How adequate is the data presentation?	4
Are units and terminology used correctly?	4
Is the number of cases adequate?	N/A
Are the experimental methods/clinical studies adequate?	3
Is the length appropriate in relation to the content?	2
Does the reader get new insights from the article?	3
Please rate the practical significance.	3
Please rate the accuracy of methods.	N/A
Please rate the statistical evaluation and quality control.	N/A
Please rate the appropriateness of the figures and tables.	4
Please rate the appropriateness of the references.	4
Please evaluate the writing style and use of language.	4
Please judge the overall scientific quality of the manuscript.	3
Are you willing to review the revision of this manuscript?	Yes

Comments to Authors:

-

Reviewer 2: anonymous

May 08, 2017

Reviewer Recommendation Term: Accept
Overall Reviewer Manuscript Rating: 75

Custom Review Questions

	Response
Is the subject area appropriate for you?	3
Does the title clearly reflect the paper's content?	3
Does the abstract clearly reflect the paper's content?	3
Do the keywords clearly reflect the paper's content?	3
Does the introduction present the problem clearly?	3
Are the results/conclusions justified?	1 - Low/No
How comprehensive and up-to-date is the subject matter presented?	3
How adequate is the data presentation?	N/A
Are units and terminology used correctly?	3
Is the number of cases adequate?	N/A
Are the experimental methods/clinical studies adequate?	N/A
Is the length appropriate in relation to the content?	3
Does the reader get new insights from the article?	3
Please rate the practical significance.	N/A
Please rate the accuracy of methods.	N/A
Please rate the statistical evaluation and quality control.	N/A
Please rate the appropriateness of the figures and tables.	N/A
Please rate the appropriateness of the references.	4
Please evaluate the writing style and use of language.	3
Please judge the overall scientific quality of the manuscript.	3
Are you willing to review the revision of this manuscript?	Yes

Comments to Authors:

All questions have been answered sufficiently.
