

Point-by-point responses

Thank you for your kindness and valuable suggestions.

According to your comments, we made the revised manuscript.

We want to review our manuscript.

We prepare 2 versions of manuscripts. One is **Marked** revised manuscript (Additional mention in **Red**, and deleted parts in **Blue**), and another is **Clear** unmarked revised manuscript.

We also made a **Point-by-point response**, separately.

Sincerely yours,

Tomohide Hori, PhD., MD.

horit@kuhp.kyoto-u.ac.jp

To Reviewer

Thank you for your valuable suggestions.

According to your suggestions, we revised our initial manuscript.

1. Numbers of Figure

Thank you for your suggestion.

According to your suggestion, the figure numbers were deleted in the revised manuscript.

2. Discussion

Thank you for your suggestion.

At first, we quoted the important references in the revised manuscript (Refs. 46-48, in the revised manuscript).

According to your suggestion, we added the key messages in the revised manuscript as follow: ‘Although we previously reported that MMP-9 plays an important role in the development of parenchymal hemorrhage and necrosis in the small remnant liver after massive hepatectomy and that successful MMP-9 inhibition attenuates the formation of hemorrhage and necrosis and might be a potential therapy to ameliorate liver injury,[11] the origin of MMP-9 production was unclear.’ (Page 22 line 17-22, in the revised manuscript) and ‘Although our results are consistent with the previous work described above, the mechanism of liver damage or regeneration are complicate. Periportal infiltration of inflammatory cells will increase the liver damage, but

this infiltration is paradoxically necessary to trigger the liver regeneration.^[46-48]
Though the balance of damage and regeneration is still unclear, we speculated that the MMP-9 produced from neutrophil may be important factor for a successful liver regeneration after EH.’ (Page 24 line 17-23, in the revised manuscript).