Review of: "Metadichol Induces CD14 Glycoprotein Expression in Human Embryonic Stem Cells and Fibroblasts"

Malgorzata Duda[1]

1 Jagiellonian University Cracow, Poland

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The title, “Metadichol Induces CD14 Glycoprotein Expression in Human Embryonic Stem Cells and Fibroblasts,” generally reflects the abstract’s content, as it directly references the study’s key findings. However, adding “in a Cell Type-Specific Manner” could emphasize the differential effects across cell types, highlighting the discovery's uniqueness. Alternatively, if hESCs are the main focus, the title could stress this aspect, e.g., “Metadichol Induces CD14 Glycoprotein Expression in Human Embryonic Stem Cells with Cell Type-Specific Modulation.”

The abstract effectively introduces the significance of CD14 in the immune system, explaining its usual presence on immune cells, which helps set up the study’s context. However, a more concise introduction could streamline the goal of the study, potentially by condensing the statement on the lack of prior research on CD14 stimulation in hESCs and fibroblasts into a single sentence. The study’s objective, to examine metadichol's influence on CD14 expression in these cells, is clearly stated. The methods—qRT-PCR and Western blotting—are appropriate and adequately referenced, though briefly explaining that metadichol is a nanoemulsion could clarify why this compound may have specific effects on different cell types. The results are presented in a straightforward manner, showing that metadichol significantly increased CD14 expression (up to 17-fold) in hESCs while decreasing it in fibroblasts. However, using the numeral “17” might improve readability in the abstract. The conclusions underscore the discovery’s relevance for cell-based therapy and immunomodulation, though adding a sentence on potential practical applications—such as in the context of a specific disease or therapeutic mechanism—would enhance the impact.

The Introduction provides a comprehensive background on the CD14 glycoprotein, highlighting its importance in the immune response as a co-receptor for toll-like receptors (TLRs), particularly TLR4. The authors effectively establish the unique aspect of this study by noting the limited exploration of CD14 expression in human embryonic stem cells (hESCs), which opens potential for new therapeutic interventions. However, there is an important lack of citations supporting certain key statements, which limits the depth and credibility of the section. For instance, in the sentence: “Overall, the difficulty in inducing CD14 expression in hESCs and fibroblasts is largely due to the specialized role of CD14 in immune cells and the lack of necessary transcriptional and signaling components in these nonmyeloid cell types,” references would strengthen the claim about the limitations in CD14 expression regulation outside immune cells. Similarly, the statements on metadichol’s antioxidant, anti-inflammatory, and stem cell-modulatory effects lack supporting literature, weakening the argument for its potential benefits in stem cell environments. Overall, while the section provides an informative lead-in to

the study's goals, it would benefit from targeted citations in the statements on the challenges of CD14 expression in hESCs and fibroblasts, as well as references explaining metadichol's mechanisms of action. These additions would substantiate the rationale for investigating metadichol's impact on CD14 expression and clarify why it may offer unique advantages in enhancing the immune modulatory and regenerative properties of stem cells.

The Materials and Methods section provides a reasonable outline of the procedures but lacks several key elements critical for reproducibility and scientific rigor.

Firstly, a detailed description of the fibroblast culture process is missing, even though the abstract mentions CD14 expression analysis in fibroblasts alongside hESCs. This omission raises concerns, as the methods for fibroblast culture, treatment, and subsequent analysis should be explicitly outlined to assess and replicate the experimental setup fully. Additionally, there is no specification of the cell lines used, such as catalog numbers, supplier information, or specific identifiers, which are essential for verifying the source and characteristics of the cell lines. For studies involving human embryonic stem cells, details on their pluripotency status and any pre-characterization data would provide necessary context. Similarly, details on the fibroblast cell line source and any known features or limitations would lend credibility to the analysis. Furthermore, the section lacks statistical details. While the experiments involved measuring expression levels of biomarkers, there is no mention of sample size, number of replicates, or statistical methods used for analyzing results. Including statistical analysis, such as significance testing and reporting of variability (e.g., standard deviation or error), is crucial in validating the observed effects of Metadichol on CD14 expression. Finally, there are no indications of controls for each experiment. For instance, additional negative or untreated controls would strengthen claims of specificity in the effects observed with Metadichol. Including these methodological details would improve the transparency and reliability of the study's results, enabling other researchers to better assess the findings and reproduce the experimental design.

The Results section, as it stands, is very limited, providing only a brief comparative statement without detailed descriptions of findings, specific observations, or any quantitative or qualitative data to interpret. Although this text notes that CD14 expression in hESCs is a novel finding, it lacks critical context and analysis that would strengthen this claim. Here's what could improve the Results section significantly:

1. **Quantitative Data**: Reporting actual expression levels of CD14 with values, p-values, or fold changes across conditions would provide a concrete basis for comparison with other studies. It is crucial to know not only *that* CD14 expression was induced but *how much* it changed relative to untreated controls.
2. **Reference to Figures**: Specific references to the figures, such as "as shown in Figure 1," could clarify and tie the observations directly to the visual data provided, enhancing readers' understanding of what is being presented.
3. **Comparative Analysis**: A more in-depth comparison with literature would enhance the findings. For example, discussing the differences or similarities in CD14 expression levels between hESCs and MSCs or other stem cells where CD14 has been studied could add valuable insight.
4. **Description of Observations**: The section should include a description of what was visually observed or measured. For instance, were there morphological changes in hESCs with increased CD14? Any notable patterns in protein

expression or cell behavior?

In summary, while this preliminary summary hints at an important finding, the section needs much more detail and statistical support to substantiate the study's conclusions fully.

The Discussion and Conclusions section presents an ambitious outlook on the therapeutic potential of metadichol based on its effects on CD14 expression in hESCs and fibroblasts. However, the interpretation of these findings seems overly optimistic given the limited data presented. While the significant upregulation of CD14 in hESCs is a novel finding, the link between increased CD14 expression and enhanced immune-modulatory functions in regenerative medicine needs more supporting evidence, particularly experimental validation of these effects in relevant therapeutic models. The suggestion that downregulation of CD14 in fibroblasts could reduce inflammation and fibrosis is interesting, yet it would benefit from references to studies demonstrating how decreased CD14 correlates with reduced fibrosis. Without direct evidence, these statements remain speculative and should be framed with caution. Additionally, the discussion briefly mentions nuclear hormone receptors (NHRs) like PPARs and VDRs, implying they play a role in CD14 modulation, yet the mechanistic connection between these receptors and metadichol's action on CD14 remains underexplored. A more in-depth discussion of this potential pathway, or a statement that further studies are required to clarify it, would strengthen the scientific rigor of the conclusions. In summary, while the section raises intriguing possibilities for metadichol's applications, it could be improved by tempering speculative claims with acknowledgment of the study's limitations and emphasizing the need for further research to substantiate these preliminary findings.

Based on the above, while the publication presents intriguing findings, it requires further refinement and a more in-depth analysis of the results. Therefore, I recommend a major revision to address the highlighted points and strengthen the study's scientific rigor.