

1. The authors needed to address only Prohibitin 1 (Phb1) because Phb1 and Phb2 is quite different. The title mentioned about prohibitin instead of Phb1, so it should be changed to prohibitin 1. I suggested that the authors needed to re-check the whole manuscript include the tables and the figures to harmonize again for this significant issue.

**Answer:** We have changed “prohibitin” into “prohibitin 1” throughout the manuscript include the figures. It should be noted that our research is entirely centered around prohibitin 1, and the previous version labeled prohibitin 1 with Phb1.

2. The Englished grammar should be substantially polished.

**Answer:** We have made comprehensive revisions and optimizations to the language and grammar issues of the entire article.

3. The citation in text is not correct format. The references format is not correct.

**Answer:** We have made revisions to all citations and references in the article according to your journal's standards.

4. In figure 1, please explain why the authors included the Western blotting results of B-actin?

**Answer:** The Western blotting results of  $\beta$ -actin in figure was used as control.  $\beta$ -Actin is a widely used internal reference protein. In the subcellular fractionation analysis in Figure 2, I selected COX IV for mitochondria and Histone H3 for nucleus as control. This meets the relevant specifications. To avoid related misunderstandings, we have provided relevant explanations in the text.

5. In figure 4, the authors should define all of the abbreviation such as UL, UR, LL, LR, G1, G2.

**Answer:** In fact, these abbreviations are commonly used for flow cytometry results and cell cycle analysis. For clearer expression, we have added the full names of these abbreviated words.

6. I wonder about the significant difference between group with only 5 specimens in each group, could the authors explain more about this statistics.

**Answer:** In the actual research process, in order to explore relevant experimental conditions and ensure repeatability, the actual number of samples in each group is 15. To ensure the stability and comparability of the Western blotting experiment, we used the same batch of experiments with 5 samples per group for data analysis. The Western blotting experiment has 5 samples per group, which is actually greater than the sample requirements required for Western blotting experiments in most papers, and can also ensure the reliability and repeatability of the results.

7. In conclusion, I also recommend that the authors pay attention to these articles:  
1. "Hadjittofi C, Ferretti M, Martin J, Harper S, Huguet E. Liver regeneration biology: Implications for liver tumour therapies. *World J Clin Oncol* 2021; 12(12): 1101-1156",  
and also 2. "Kiseleva YV, Antonyan SZ, Zharikova TS, Tupikin KA, Kalinin DV, Zharikov YO. Molecular pathways of liver regeneration: A comprehensive review. *World J Hepatol.* 2021 Mar 27;13(3):270-290. doi: 10.4254/wjh.v13.i3.270. PMID: 33815672; PMCID: PMC8006075." and take into account the data of these articles in

your manuscript, which will also enhance the scientific significance of your manuscript.

**Answer:** These two references have been added to the manuscript