

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 38740

Title: Mini-review: Autonomic Nervous System Network and Liver Regeneration

Reviewer's code: 00227505

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-03-15

Date reviewed: 2018-03-15

Review time: 5 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Remarks to the Author The manuscript titled " Mini-review: Autonomic Nervous System Network and Liver Regeneration" has been reviewed. As I pointed out in my previous review, it was difficult to interpret the figures the authors provided. There were no changes in the manuscript. I felt the authors did not face the comment in sincerity. Unfortunately, I have to conclude that the findings presented in this manuscript may be incomplete to this journal. Critique: It was difficult to interpret whether the figures author provided bring direct correlation to liver regeneration. The figures should be an essential, because the detailed description is not made in the manuscript. A short description and insufficient figures do not make any sense. • I request to prepare the chronological results in figure 1 and 2. Only 1 point of 24hr in Figure 1 and 48hr in Figure 2 are insufficient. Several points would be needed. In addition, more information about the figures should have been made available. What is lacking in this manuscript is



**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
https:// www.wjgnet.com

the lack of adequate information on the Figures. What is Cap+PH? There is no detailed information of the word. Even "PH". For figures 1 and 2, the authors would be better to prepare even photos, separately. We know the PCNA staining for mouse is tricky. • The authors stated "While it is difficult to apply these results directly in humans, we believe that this study may represent a step toward the development of essential therapeutics to promote liver regeneration." What is this meaning? How do the authors propose to promote liver regeneration, and what is the authors perspection and expectation?

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 38740

Title: Mini-review: Autonomic Nervous System Network and Liver Regeneration

Reviewer's code: 00225294

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-03-15

Date reviewed: 2018-03-19

Review time: 4 Days

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have considered most of the criticism, issued in the report. The minireview is interesting

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 38740

Title: Mini-review: Autonomic Nervous System Network and Liver Regeneration

Reviewer's code: 00255973

Reviewer's country: Canada

Science editor: Xue-Jiao Wang

Date sent for review: 2018-03-15

Date reviewed: 2018-03-23

Review time: 8 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"/> 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

This is a review article based on the authors' recent work published in Ref. 49, on the role of the sympathetic nervous system in liver regeneration involving serotonin released from intestinal chromaffin cells following hepatic injury. While the topic of this article is certainly of interest, and Table 1 recapitulating various cytokines and growth factors is informative, Fig. 1-3 are reproduction of the data presented in ref. 49 (and possibly in Ref 50) in a different format. As these data are represented in Fig. 4, it is better to remove Fig. 1-3 from this review, which would not diminish the message this review intends to convey. The acknowledgement and contribution sections should also be modified accordingly as this is not a regular research paper. The article is informative, however the authors could make it coherent through language editing to improve readability.