

Dear Editors,

We appreciate the reviewer's thoughtful comments they really supported us to improve the manuscript. Revisions are highlighted using the track-change option of MS word. Below are point-by-point responses to the reviewer's comments.

Comment 1: The authors focus on the comparison of SG1, SG2 and control group. Current figures and tables are confusing in typography. Try to put the same content of the three groups in a figure or a table, so as to facilitate comparison.

Answer: The reviewer rightly notes that we have compared the architectonics of the lobules and circulatory bed of normal, regenerated and re-regenerated livers and that the main focus of the article is the comparison of Study Group 1 (SG₁), Study Group 2 (SG₂) and Control Group (CG). The international group of authors of the article was faced with a choice: to compare the morphological features of the microcirculatory bed of animal livers in these groups separately - according to the characteristics of each research method outcomes, or as a whole, taking into consideration the complex results of all research methods. We chose the latter, so much so that it would be virtually impossible to photograph and stereotypically compare the identical areas in different groups of animals. The description of the material in the article is constructed in such a way that the description of the research object in each group is complex, based on the results obtained using different methods, thus creating a general picture of the morphology of the microcirculatory bed of animal livers in a given group. Later, the results are compared to the similar data of other groups. Given the approach of describing the material, we believe, it would be more convenient for the reader to find the results of the study in different collages- control group, regeneration group, re-regeneration group. This would help to create a unified picture of the correlation between the data obtained by different research methods. It should be noted that the corresponding figures 3, 4 and 5 contain a different number of photos (fig. 3 - 12 photos; fig. 4 - 10 photos, and fig. 5- 9 photos). This is due to the fact that different figures show different interesting morphological features ("findings"), which, in our opinion, better reflects the normal, regenerative and re-regenerative features of the microcirculatory bed.

Rearranging of the figures and creating collages according to the research methods, we believe, will create more inconvenience for the reader, who will have to constantly move from one photo to the other and back while reading a description of a microcirculatory bed of any group, and will complicate the overall perception of research results.

Besides, we tried to re-arrange the figures as recommended by the reviewer, but we “found” that this also required to change the description of morphological features of the liver microcirculatory beds of the comparable groups according to the research methods. Thus, in the case of re-arranging figures, we believe that the whole text will also need to be re-arranged, which means new formatting and comprehension of the article.

In light of the above, please support us so we don't have to change the figure collages. In addition, the reviewer's recommendation to give titles to each figure and to clarify descriptions is fully shared.

Besides, we have split figure 1 and accordingly renumbered the rest of them.

Comment 2. In table 2, data are shown in two different means, and please choose the appropriate one. As we know, the normal distributed data are expressed by mean±SD, while the data which do not follow a normal distribution are expressed by median (range).

Answer: Thank you for your comment. You are absolutely right in case of normal distribution mean with standard deviation is the preferred option for describing central tendency, while the median is more appropriate for skewed data. However, as you know there are no ideal conditions in real-life settings, and obtaining ideally normally distributed data is rarely possible. That is why we showed both means and medians. However, we agree that choosing one of them would be more appropriate and convenient for the reader. In our cases, the data distribution approximates normal distribution, which allows reporting mean values, and following your suggestion, we decided to keep only means in the table"

Study Groups	III zone (mean±SD)		I zone (mean±SD)	
	area	perimeter	area	perimeter
Control Group (CG)	283±88	64±10	255±66	62±8
Study group 1 (SG ₁)	331±95	71±11	348±90	71±10
Study group 2 (SG ₂)	390±128	75±11	372±107	73±11

Area - I zone of CG vs III zone of CG - P value <0,05
Perimeter - I zone CG vs. III zone CG - P value >0.05

Area - III zone CG vs SG₁ - P value <0,05
Perimeter - III zone CG vs SG₁ - P value < 0,05
Perimeter - I zone CG vs SG₁ - P value <0,05
Area - I zone SG₁ vs III zone SG₁ - P value >0.05
Perimeter - I zone SG₁ vs III zone SG₁ - P value >0.05

Area - III zone CG vs SG₂ - P value<0,05
Perimeter - III zone CG vs SG₂ - P value <0,05
Area - III zone SG₁ vs SG₂ - P value<0,05
Area - I zone SG₁ vs SG₂ - P value>0.05
Perimeter - III zone SG₁ vs SG₂ - P value >0.05
Perimeter - I zone SG₁ vs SG₂ - P value >0.05
Area - I zone SG₂ vs III zone SG₂ - P value >0.05
Perimeter - I zone SG₂ vs III zone SG₂ - P value >0.05

Comment 3. All tables and figures have no name.

Answer: The remark is absolutely correct. We have given each figure and table a corresponding title and clarified the definitions so that the figures and tables can be easily understood independently of the text.

In addition, there are several minor comments.

Comment 4. The overall article format does not conform to the standard, and please refer to the previous published articles. For example, in results, 1) 2) 3) and 1 2 3.

Answer: We have taken into account all the requirements of the journal (including reviewing previously published articles) and made all appropriate changes.

Comment 5. The authors should pay attention to whether the difference is statistically significant.

Answer: The note is taken into consideration. The following words are added to the text where needed: “significantly”, “notably”, etc.

Comment 6. Too many references, please cut down appropriately. So, we advise major revision.

Answer: The note is taken into consideration. The list of references is shortened.

All the revisions are highlighted using the track-change option of MS word.

Furthermore, we had several key points of revising our manuscript regarding language quality, special requirements for figures, tables, references, research highlights, authors contribution and providing the approved grant application form.

All above editorial remarks are taken into consideration and corrected as requested, namely:

- We have provided all figures with legends in PowerPoint so that they are editable

- The text was reviewed by Native-English speaker Professor Trevor George Cartledge, PhD in Microbiology from Cardiff University and Sopio Totibadze, MA in English Language and Linguistics from Leiden University. Her certificate of C2 level is provides.
- We have added research highlights and authors contribution.
- We have provide the copy of Approval Document from Funding Agency signed by both sides.

Dear Sir,

We hope that the revised version of our manuscript will be appreciated and will have a chance to be published in your esteemed journal.

With respect,

Dimitri Kordzaia