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DEAR EDITOR

We are grateful to the authors whose work was reported in the Journal of Applied Pharmaceutical Science Vol. 12(09), pp 067–075, September 2022 with the title “Java Sea Spirulina platensis chemical analysis and its protective ability against H2O2-exposed umbilical cord mesenchymal stem cells according to CD73, CD90, and CD105, viability, and HIF-1 alpha docking” (Prijanti et al., 2022). This is very important information about the effect of Spirulina platensis on H2O2 exposure which tends to increase MSC viability.

We would like to give our thoughts, particularly on the characterization method of MSCs in this study. We highly regarded the author’s use of stemness markers of MSCs like CD73, CD90, and CD105, and hematopoietic markers (CD45, CD34, CD11b, CD19, and HLA-DR) to characterize MSC culture. Unfortunately, this study did not report on the differentiation ability of MSCs. Based on The International Society for Cellular Therapy, there are three criteria to define MSCs in this study. We highly regarded the author’s use of stemness markers of MSCs like CD73, CD90, and CD105, and hematopoietic markers (CD45, CD34, CD11b, CD19, and HLA-DR) to characterize MSC culture. Unfortunately, this study did not report on the differentiation ability of MSCs. Based on the International Society for Cellular Therapy, there are three criteria to define MSCs. First, MSCs must be adherence to tissue culture flasks. Second, MSCs must express CD105, CD73, and CD90 and must lack expression of CD45, CD34, CD14 or CD11b, CD79a or CD19, and HLA class II as measured by flow cytometry. Third, the cells must be able to differentiate into osteoblasts, adipocytes, and chondrocytes (Dominici et al., 2006). So, it is important to check the potential differentiation ability of MSCs.

In the Discussion, the authors said that “Some studies gave positive results in overcoming oxidative stress using the 125 ng/ml Spirulina (SP) extract.” But there are no references included. Tajvidi et al. (2021) reported that prior to obtaining the final extract concentration, it is preferable to perform an MTT cytotoxicity assay using SP or Arthrospira platensis aqueous extract concentration that was toxic to 50% of the cells to get IC50. Then the extract was used at concentrations of 129.5 µg/ml and 366.4 µg/ml to treat the human Caucasian non-small-cell lung adenocarcinoma A549 cell line and human foreskin fibroblast (HFF) cell lines respectively for 24 hours (Tajvidi et al., 2021).

Furthermore, the justification for using final H2O2 concentrations of 100 and 300 µM should be explained. Facchin et al. (2018) reported that H2O2 was used to compare the behavior of human Wharton’s jelly-derived MSCs and human adipose tissue-derived stem cells in response to oxidative stress at various concentrations (ranging from 50 to 400 µM) and time exposures (1 or 2 hours) (Facchin et al., 2018). Saleem et al. (2021) also reported that human bone marrow stem cells were exposed to progressively higher concentrations of H2O2 125, 250, 500, 750, and 1000 µM in DMEM with 1% FBS at 37°C with 5% CO2 for 2 hours in order to establish the oxidative stress model (Saleem et al., 2021).

As for the molecular docking results, we checked the PDB ID for HIF protein (5LAS) on the PDB database and found that this protein has two unique ligands, N-Oxalylglycine (ID OGA) and manganese ion (ID MN). However, the authors did not explain why N-Oxalylglycine was not used in the docking step as a control despite the presence of 3,4-OH-benzoic acid in the SP extract. Since there are two binding areas proposed for HIF-1,
the authors should also clearly state the native ligands used as a control for the active binding site and the DNA binding domain respectively along with their key amino acid residues implicated in the interaction and whether these residues match those in their corresponding native ligand. The information on which compounds interact in the binding site and which one in the DNA binding domain should be provided because the paper only mentioned phycocyanobilin in the DNA binding and canthaxanthin in the active binding sites. The interaction for other compounds in the SP extract should also be described.
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