



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 67639

**Title:** Ultrastructural changes in porcine liver sinusoidal endothelial cells of machine perfused liver donated after cardiac death

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05433027

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-05-19

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-05-24 12:43

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-05-30 08:11

**Review time:** 5 Days and 19 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<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

<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
-------------------------------------	---

### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The superiority of the machine perfusion preservation (MP) to simple cold storage was reported in kidney and liver preservation donated after cardiac death(DCD), the MP of the DCD grafts has been discussed about the optimal conditions including perfusion temperature, oxygenation, flow rate and pressure, steady or pulsatile flow, oxygen and nutrition-containing solution have also been reported to have numerous advantages to liver transplantation, but there are few reports about fusion temperature, especially midthermic machine perfusion (MMP). The authors comparatively analyzed the ultrastructural changes in the LSEC and sinusoids around them at four hours after HMP or MMP by using OM-SEM. MP alleviated the ER damage of LSEC caused by warm ischemia, MMP temperature conditions restore the metabolism of LSEC via the normalization of cristae of mitochondria and prevent the damage of the liver graft. The findings of the authors are very interesting. It is suggested that MMP is more effective than HMP in alleviating graft injury after DCD; However, there is still a long way for clinical application, which is also the direction of the author's efforts today In the abstract, the author only describes how to group, but does not describe the use of electron microscopy to evaluate the ultrastructures. In pictures 2-5, there are groups A, B, C, and D. can you put A, B, C, and D together, so that you can see the differences visually through horizontal comparison in one picture. The ultrastructural damage of liver was confirmed by electron microscope. Can the activity of hepatocyte be reevaluated by deepening method.



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 67639

**Title:** Ultrastructural changes in porcine liver sinusoidal endothelial cells of machine perfused liver donated after cardiac death

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer’s code:** 03660289

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor, Surgeon

**Reviewer’s Country/Territory:** Italy

**Author’s Country/Territory:** Japan

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-05-19

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-05-20 09:08

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-05-30 14:33

**Review time:** 10 Days and 5 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input 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



**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**

<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
-------------------------------------	---

### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The manuscript is well written and interesting and provides insight into ultrastructural changes of DCD livers after machine perfusion. I have only a few issues: 1. The HMP used in group A is similar to dual-HOPE except for the portal line, which is not oxygenated. Can the authors comment on this? 2. Euro-collins solution was used for cold flush, while UW solution was used for HMP/MMP. Can the authors comment on the change of perfusion solution? 3. The authors say that they used an unpaired two-tailed t-test to compare groups A and B, but I cannot find any p-value in the text and figures.