



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Hepatology

**Manuscript NO:** 57480

**Title:** The CDK inhibitors p21 and p27 function as critical regulators of liver regeneration following 90% hepatectomy in the rat.

**Reviewer's code:** 03671529

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor, Senior Lecturer

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Russia

**Author's Country/Territory:** France

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-06-15

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-06-15 15:01

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-06-15 18:50

**Review time:** 3 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

A very interesting article was submitted for review. The subject of this study is fully consistent with the topics of the Journal, and the title reflects the content of the article. When considering the manuscript a few remarks arose. 1. A number of studies have been devoted to the problem of liver regeneration after subtotal resection. These studies indicate the causes of impaired regeneration after subtotal liver resection. This reason is a block of the proliferation of hepatocytes. However, different authors point to different points of the mitotic cycle at which disturbances occur after subtotal resection of the liver. In addition, probably, different animal species have their own peculiarities of block of hepatocyte cell cycle after subtotal liver resection. In connection with this, it is recommended to review and discuss the data obtained in the indicated articles on the rat model in the discussion section. - Elchaninov AV, Fatkhudinov TK, Usman NY, Kananykhina EY, Arutyunyan IV, Makarov AV, Lokhonina AV, Eremina IZ, Surovtsev VV, Goldshtein DV, Bolshakova GB, Glinkina VV, Sukhikh GT (2018b) Dynamics of macrophage populations of the liver after subtotal hepatectomy in rats. BMC Immunol 19(1): 23 <https://bmcimmunol.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12865-018-0260-1> - Inherent control of hepatocyte proliferation after subtotal liver resection. Elchaninov A, Fatkhudinov T, Makarov A, Vorobieva I, Lokhonina A, Usman N, Kananykhina E, Vishnyakova P, Nikitina M, Goldshtein D, Bolshakova G, Glinkina V, Sukhikh G. Cell Biol Int. 2019 Jul 12. doi: 10.1002/cbin.11203. PMID: 31297922 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/cbin.11203> 2. The authors indicate that the t test was used for statistical analysis. Did the authors check the conditions for using this criterion? What criteria was used for this?