



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_44215
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of dental pulp stem cell (DPSC) biomarkers following induction with Bone Morphogenic Protein 2 (BMP-2)
Type of the Article	Original Research 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: (<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>This is an potential useful article about the ability of BMP-2 to induce proliferation and differentiation of DPSC isolates into mineral forming bone cell precursor lineages expressing the appropriate biomarkers.</p> <p>There are some points I need to consider,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The indicative species of MSC markers Nestin, NANOG, Oct-4 and Sox-2 should be briefly defined in the introduction part • How many teeth were used to obtain DPSC used in this study protocol? • The distribution of the patients age and gender may be added... • It is mentioned as 'Collection of DPSC began with participants of the study undergoing extractions – primarily third molars.' Are they impacted third molar? And what is the reason for the extraction of third molar aged around 7 years? • Is there any data about the cells receive the International Society for Cellular Therapy (ISCT) criteria? For example CD positive and negative markers... • Why authors selected to use the dose of 10 ng/mL BMP-2? It should be explained and discussed... • In the discussion part, the limitations of the study may be specified • The discussion should be improved by the comparisons of the data exist in the literature about the effects of BMP-2 on DPSC • The possible explanations/suggestions about the differences between rapid, intermediate or slow doubling times should be added • The staining method used to obtain Photo microscopy in Figure3B? • The needs for further studies may be mentioned 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Cigdem Atalayin
Department, University & Country	Ege University School of Dentistry, Turkey