Dear editor,

Many thanks for the insightful comments and suggestions of the referees. We have made corresponding revisions according to their advice. Words in red are the changes we have made in the text.

1) One major issue is the fact that there is no figure reproduced from other published works. This is a mandatory subject in order to provide valuable information for readers. We reported some figures from other published works.

2) One missing aspect of the review is the discussion about the animals used in experiments. According to Table 2, different animals were used (rats, mice, dogs, rabbits, beagles) and a discussion about this aspect is mandatory. We added the description of in vivo experiments in the “Results” section.

3) I think that the words “multilayered scaffolds” (line 310) must be reformulated because is not correct.

We have corrected the words “multilayered scaffolds”, replacing it with the words “bi- and trilayered scaffolds”

4) Regarding the discussion about CS-based scaffolds combined with other biomaterials, I expect to find some information about the ratio of these biomaterials. What is the optimal percent of hyaluronic acid or hydroxyapatite when we want to add these biomaterials on CS-based scaffolds, according to the studies analyzed by the authors? We have added information about biomaterials ratio and concentrations in Table 2.

5) The authors must reformulate the conclusion section. I think that the authors must provide in conclusion section a clear vision related to the combination between CS and ceramic biomaterials versus CS and polymeric biomaterials. Also, it is better to clarify the influence of the growth factors and stem cells on CS-based scaffolds. According the existing sentence, the idea that growth factors or stem cells will improve the mechanical properties of CS-based scaffolds is not real. (“However, the combination between CS and other biomaterials (HA, AL, PLGA, PLA, PCL), growth factors (bFGF, BMP, IGF-1) and stem cells (PDLSCs, hDFCs, hJBMMSCs) may improve its mechanical and biological properties, providing a better regenerative effect.”).

We corrected the “Conclusion” section.

Thank you for receiving our manuscript and considering it for publication. We appreciate your time and look forward to your response.
Yours sincerely,
Dorina Lauritano