



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 38315

**Title:** Evaluation of safety for hepatectomy in a novel mouse model with nonalcoholic-steatohepatitis

**Reviewer's code:** 01805500

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2018-02-14

**Date reviewed:** 2018-02-14

**Review time:** 10 Hours

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Authors state that.... NASH mice were fed an HF diet for 4 weeks, intraperitoneally injected with CCl4 twice a week for the final 2 weeks, and intraperitoneally injected with T0901317 solubilized in DMSO for the final 5 days. The CCl4 dose was 0.1 mL/kg, and the T0901317 dose was 2.5 mg/kg ..... referring to other authors. First of all, not only NASH but also simple fatty liver of donors is a drawback for liver transplantation. This review is a little bit perplexed about this model of NASH, due to previous data of literature, i.e.,The LXR activator T0901317 produces several severe side effects, including hepatic steatosis...(quoted ref. n 28). Other data of literature offer a different approach, i.e. .... The liver X receptor agonist T0901317 protects mice from high fat diet-induced obesity and insulin resistance. AAPS J. 2013; 15: 258-66.



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 38315

**Title:** Evaluation of safety for hepatectomy in a novel mouse model with nonalcoholic-steatohepatitis

**Reviewer's code:** 02536349

**Reviewer's country:** Turkey

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2018-02-21

**Date reviewed:** 2018-02-24

**Review time:** 3 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y ] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y ] Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y ] No	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y ] No	

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

A successful animal study regarding the capacity of regeneration and function of residual liver in fatty liver compared to normal liver in mice. ps: Some recommendations for grammar. 1- In Conclusion section: Instead of “The function of the residual NASH liver is impaired compared with normal liver. A larger residual volume is required to maintain liver function in NASH” It may be better as: “The function of the residual liver is impaired in fatty liver compared to normal liver. A larger residual volume is required to maintain liver functions in mice with NASH” 2- Instead of “Mice of each group were sacrificed at 6 and 12 h after PH” “Mice of each group were sacrificed at 6h and 12 h after PH” 3- Instead of “steatotic liver” use “fatty liver” since No exact match found for "steatotic" in any English dictionaries. Some recommendations for grammar. 1- In Conclusion section: Instead of “The function



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

of the residual NASH liver is impaired compared with normal liver. A larger residual volume is required to maintain liver function in NASH” It may be better as: “The function of the residual liver is impaired in fatty liver compared to normal liver. A larger residual volume is required to maintain liver functions in mice with NASH” 2- Instead of “Mice of each group were sacrificed at 6 and 12 h after PH” “Mice of each group were sacrificed at 6h and 12 h after PH” 3- Instead of “steatotic liver” use “fatty liver” since No exact match found for "steatotic" in any English dictionaries.



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology

**Manuscript NO:** 38315

**Title:** Evaluation of safety for hepatectomy in a novel mouse model with nonalcoholic-steatohepatitis

**Reviewer’s code:** 02636166

**Reviewer’s country:** Taiwan

**Science editor:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Date sent for review:** 2018-02-21

**Date reviewed:** 2018-02-25

**Review time:** 4 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Dear Editor: Dr. Ozawa and colleagues made a novel experiment in NASH mice to demonstrate that the liver resection volume may affect the survival rate in subjects with NASH. In general, the study was well designed and the results were promising. I have only one concern that did the authors measure the histology and pathology NASH severity from the resected liver tissue in the three groups? It might be helpful to make a tight control that the NASH severity might be similar among groups at the surgery.