Liver regeneration in surgical animal models –

A historical perspective and clinical implications

K. E. Mortensen[1] A. Revhaug[2]

[1]Surgical Research Laboratory, Institute of Clinical Medicine, University of Tromsoe, 9038 Tromsoe, Norway, [2] Dept. of Gastrointestinal Surgery, University Hospital of North-Norway, 9038 Tromsoe, Norway.

Contact information: Kim Erlend Mortensen (corresponding author)
Surgical Research Laboratory
Institute of Clinical Medicine
University of Tromsoe
Tromsoe, Norway
Tel.: +004791515756
Fax: +004777626605
E-mail: kimem@fagmed.uit.no

Abstract

   Background: The development of split-liver grafting and multimodal treatment of liver tumours with neoadjuvant chemotherapy and preoperative portal vein embolization has increased the therapeutic options and extended the life expectancy of the patient with liver failure and hepatic malignancy. However, despite improved perioperative intensive care, some patients still experience post-resection liver failure in part due to insufficient regeneration. **Aim**: The aim of this review is to give the reader a historical synopsis of the major trends in animal research on liver regeneration from the early experiments with the Eck fistula in 1877 to modern investigation. A major focus of the article is on the translational value of the experimental surgery. **Methods:** A systematic review of the published literature in English in Medline was undertaken with the search words "pig, porcine, dog, canine, liver regeneration, experimental". **Results:** The evolution of the various models tentatively explaining the process of liver regeneration is described: the humoral theory (or the quality of the hepatic perfusate), sinusoidal hemodynamics and the flow theory (or the quantity of the hepatic perfusate), the importance of oxygen- and energy status in the regenerating liver, and the liver as a source of growth factors and stimulus. Experimental work on liver regeneration has resulted in the surgical principles and practice of preoperative portal vein embolization to induce hyperplasia of the remnant to be after PHx, and portal vein decompression by portosystemic shunting to reduce sinusoidal congestion in the case of SFSS after liver transplantation. Apart from these, there are no novel patient therapies available to aid and augment the process of liver regeneration after extended liver resections, toxic liver insults or in the cirrhotic patient. This is in spite of all the modern technological advancements and the knowledge gained on the microscopic and molecular aspects of liver regeneration in the past 20-30 years. **Conclusion**: We suggest that it is time to turn back to the systemic large animal surgical research on liver regeneration as it offers a more integrated, systemic biological

understanding of this complex process, and that a more clinically relevant progression could possibly be made with a closer collaboration between the hepatologist, liver surgeon/transplant surgeon and the laboratory scientist.

Introduction

Modern liver surgery has seen the development of split-liver grafting [1] and more aggressive, multimodal treatment of primary and secondary liver malignancies, increasing the possibilities for resection [2]. Despite continuous improvement in surgical technique and perioperative intensive care, some patients still experience deficient regeneration and functional failure in the so-called small-for-size syndrome (SFSS) occurring after liver transplantation if the graft is of marginal size (graft weight/body weight ratio, GRWR < 0.8 %) [3], or if the liver remnant is too small after extended hepatectomy (< 25 % functionally normal liver remaining)[2]. Postresectional liver dysfunction is also a problem with the increasing use of neoadjuvant chemotherapy for colorectal metastasis [4]. The vast amount of research performed on liver regeneration to date has had relatively little practical consequence for the patient with a failing liver except for the development of liver support systems such as MARS, bridging the patient to transplantation, re-transplantation or as a support during recuperation of the native liver [5]. Contemporary liver surgery is therefore in need of a better understanding of the mechanisms controlling liver regeneration in order to design new treatment strategies to support the functionally deficient and failing organ. At the same time, strategies are needed to enhance its regenerative capacity be it a small-for-size graft or a failing remnant after hepatectomy with or without neoadjuvant chemotherapy. The purpose of this literature review is to therefore to summarise previous experimental in-vivo research on liver regeneration in animals, beginning with the Eck fistula model in 1877 and up to present day investigations, focusing on how this field has developed as a result of the interplay between clinical challenges and preclinical surgical research (please see table 1. for a chronological overview of the studies discussed below). The review is organized according to past and present general themes on liver regeneration and their devolment over time. For

each theme, we aim to highlight the residual controversies, formulate new hypothesis and suggest novel experimental models in which they could be tested.

By writing this review we aim to give the reader a historical overview of the major trends in animal research on liver regeneration with emphasis on the importance of in vivo models, the value of translational research, and the necessity of increased collaboration between the basic laboratory scientist and the clinician. In our opinion, these measures are necessary if we are to make any further progress in aiding the patient with a failing liver due to insufficient regeneration.

Sinusoidal hemodynamics and the flow theory

The study of liver regeneration was largely triggered by Eck's seminal paper on complete portocaval shunting (PCS = Eck fistula) in dogs in 1877 [6] which led to the belief that the liver's homeostasis was not dependant upon portal blood perfusion. However, this was later contested by Hahn in 1893 [7] whose dogs did poorly with the Eck fistula, showing signs of liver atrophy, weight loss and encephalopathy. The changes incurred by PCS was for many ensuing years thought to be the result of a lack of sinusoidal distension and/or lack of portal flow <u>through</u> the liver (as apposed to a lack of the substances transported <u>to</u> the liver in the portal blood). The theory of sinusoidal distension was corroborated by Grindlay and Bollman [8] who in 1952 observed that the liver regenerated after a 70 % partial hepatectomy (PHx) in dogs when constricting the vena cava above the liver, and hence increasing the hepatic venous pressure (in a Budd-Chiari like manner). The theory of liver volume and functional maintenance by sinusoidal flow per se received much support due to Child's model of portocaval transposition in 1953, where, after a 70 % PHx in dogs, the portal vein and vena cava inferior were switched surgically, resulting in the liver remnant receiving only systemic

blood from the caudal stump of the vena cava inferior, and all portal blood being diverted to the cranial stump of the vena cava inferior [9]. The observation that the remnant liver (in the portocaval transposition group) regenerated by 50 % seemed to support the theory that sinusoidal flow in itself was adequate to initiate and support liver regeneration, irrespective of the quality of the perfusate. Conceptually, the observations in both studies could have been the result of a systemic overflow of growth stimulating factors from the upper gastrointestinal tract away from the portal circulation and back to the liver via the hepatic artery in Grindlay's experiments, and via the vena cava inferior in Child's experiments, but this possibility is not discussed in either article. Further solid support to the "flow theory" came from several canine experiments conducted in the 1950's and early 60's with portal vein arterialisation (after portocaval shunting) showing that this manoeuvre would not only arrest the changes incurred by the Eck fistula such as "meat intoxication", weight loss of the animals and liver atrophy [10-12], but also allow liver regeneration to occur after a 42 % PHx [13]. However, several of these [11,12] and other studies [14-16] also reported the development of vasculitis, periportal fibrosis, intima proliferation, lipid infiltration and the development of cirrhosis in long term (5 years) arterialised livers [12]. This would indicate the unphysiological nature of portal vein arterialisation. A note of interest at this point is the preceding work of Rous and Larimore in 1920 [17] which illustrated what they coined the phenomenon of "parenchymal shift". Upon ligating one of the portal vein branches in the rabbit, they observed ipsilateral atrophy and contra lateral hypertrophy of the liver, postulating "the liver is wholly a portal organ, finding its reason for being in the substances carried to it in the portal blood". This study had clearly implicated the importance of the humoral effect of splanchninc inflow on liver homeostasis; however, the flow theory prevailed unchallenged until the mid 1960's.

The evolution of the "humoral theory"

With the advent of auxiliary liver grafting in the 1960's unveiling the phenomenon of graft atrophy due to the portal steal effect, came the realization that there must be certain substances delivered to the liver in the portal blood only, upon which the organ is dependant to regenerate and / or maintain its volume and function [18]. One could no longer regard the liver's homeostasis as a result of mechanical portal flow stimulus (which was hypothesized by Rous and Larimore 40 years earlier). A period of intense investigation followed from 1965 to 1978 with a large body of experiments revealing the importance of the hormonal and nutritional influence in portal blood on liver regeneration, in particular insulin. This period commenced with canine models of split portocaval transposition (one portal branch perfused with blood from vena cava inferior and the other portal branch perfused with portal blood, with similar flow rates and oxygen tension). This eliminated the possible confounding effect that graft rejection could have had in causing graft atrophy in previous auxiliary transplantation experiments. After three months of split portocaval transposition in dogs, Marchioro et al observed hypertrophy with glykogen deposition, increased DNA synthesis and mitosis on the side receiving splanchninc blood and atrophy on the side receiving systemic blood [19]. The importance of portal blood supply to the liver's homeostasis in auxiliary grafting was consequently corroborated the same year (1965) by Tretbar et al [20], Thomford et al [21], and Halgrimson et al [22]. Marchioro also substituted the blood flow in one of the portal vein branches over three months, observing that increasing the flow and oxygen supply to one side of the liver, could not compensate for the qualitative loss of the portal blood stimulus [23].

Given that the trophic substances seemed to be found in the portal blood, subsequent investigations were designed to disclose their origin. Separating the portal inflow coming from the upper GI-tract (distal stomach, duodenum, pancreas and spleen) from that

originating from the small intestine (model of splanchninc flow division), Marchioro transplanted auxiliary liver grafts supplying them with portal blood from the small intestine only, while the native liver received pancreaticogastroduodenosplenic blood. This resulted in atrophy, centrilobular necrosis, cytoplasmic fat deposits in hepatocytes, hemosiderin deposits in Kupffer cells and collapse of the reticulin framework in the grafts [24]. Further research in the 1970's utilized various canine models of splanchnic evisceration: Price et al eviscerated dogs, simultaneously performing portocaval transposition (maintaining liver perfusion with systemic blood), with or without glucagon infusion and suggested that glucagon was a main factor as it could reverse the many effects of portal blood deprivation [25,26]. This was challenged by Starzl et al a year later in experiments of splanchninc flow division with diversion of the pancreaticogastroduodenosplenic venous blood to one half of the liver and blood from the small intestine to the other half resulting in atrophy of liver parenchyma not receiving pancreaticogastroduodenosplenic venous blood, postulating that the substance in question was insulin [27]. This theory was later corroborated by the same investigator upon constructing an Eck fistula and infusing insulin into one of the portal vein branches, which limited the atrophy (on the side receiving insulin) caused by the portocaval shunt [28] and further fortified by observing liver atrophy and lack of regeneration after partial hepatectomy in alloxan induced diabetic dogs [29]. However, contrary to Starzl's findings [30], Duguay et al did find some additive effect of glucagon infusion in addition to insulin in 1976 [31]. At this stage, it became apparent that the liver regeneration observed in Childs model of PHx and portocaval transposition, once thought to be the result of flow stimulus, was in fact the result of redirecting the portal stimulants through the portocaval shunt to the systemic circulation and back to the liver via vena cava inferior [32]. Further experiments in dogs with various degrees of splanchninc evisceration and partial hepatectomy followed by portal infusion of insulin and or glucagon confirmed the importance of insulin in the process of liver

regeneration but also demonstrated that this hormone could not compensate for total evisceration [33]. This hormonal effect was also demonstrated in the liver after splanchninc evisceration and portocaval shunting and intraportal insulin infusion, preventing atrophy and glycogen depletion and promoting DNA synthesis [34].

With the importance of insulin for liver maintenance and regeneration firmly established, research evolved to screen for other potential hepatotrophic substances in the portal blood. Francavilla et al utilized a canine Eck fistula model in 1991, infusing triiodothyronine (T3), glucagon, prolactin, angiotensin II, vasopressin, noreprinephrine, estradiol, Insulin like Growth Factor II (IGF-II), Hepatic Stimulatory Substance (HSS), Transforming Growth Factor (TGF)-alpha, Hepaocyte growth Factor (HGF, also termed Hepatopoietin-A), Epidermal Growth Factor (EGF), Transforming Growth factor (TGF)-beta, tamoxifen, Interleukin (IL)-1 and 2, and insulin into one of the detached portal vein branches above the shunt [35]. Insulin and partly T3, IGF-II, HSS, TGF-alpha, and HGF inhibited liver atrophy. The remaining substances were inert. Interestingly, TGF-beta increased the atrophy but this effect was reversed upon concomitant insulin infusion. This is an important study because it illustrates the importance of performing in-vivo studies when studying a complex and integrated process such as liver regeneration: several of the above substances were found to enhance hepatocyte replication in in-vitro studies (EGF [36], angiotensin II [37], noreprinephrine [38]) but they were not active when placed in-context in a living, biological system as was done in the above study. Certainly, cell culture models have their advantage in that one may study signalling pathways in individual cell lines without the confounding effect of different cell types but the cross-talk between the extracellular matrix and different cell types in the liver parenchyma known to be particularly important to liver regeneration, is missed [39]. This leaves us with the classic scientific paradox of the investigator changing the things he aims to observe by his act of intervention when utilizing the more "mechanistic"

model of cell culture. In contradistinction to this, animal models affords a more integrated and realistic means to study the highly coordinated process of liver regeneration.

Quality versus quantity- the conflict between the flow- and humoral theories approaches an end?

Despite the numerous surgical models with splanchninc vascular manipulation and liver transplantation over a period of approximately 100 years implying the dominant role of humoral regulative mechanisms initiating liver regeneration and maintaining liver homeostasis, new studies appeared suggesting that increased sinusoidal flow after PHx could play a role after all. In the late 1990's, Satoh et al [40] and Niiya et al [41] suggested that the acute portal hypertension and increased shear-stress over the sinusoidal endothelial surface caused by a partial hepatectomy (and increased flow per gram remaining liver) triggered the regeneration cascade. In the same period, increased endothelial shear stress was found to modulate the endothelial production of nitric oxide (NO) and influence the hepatic vascular bed [42-44]. Later, liver regeneration after PHx in rats was shown to be inhibited by the administration of the NO antagonist N^G –nitro-L-arginine methyl ester, and restored by the NO donor 3-morpholinosydnonimine-1 (SIN-1) [45,46]. This potential renaissance of the flow theory was challenged by Mortensen et al in a porcine model of PHx and gene expression analysis. By increasing the degree of liver resection (and consequently the rise in portal pressure and flow per gram remaining liver tissue) they observed a switch of the genetic response in the liver remnant from one of primarily cell cycle propagation (after 62 % PHx) to that of modulation of the intracellular redox status and the caspase cascade (after 75 % PHx) [47]. The different genetic response was proposed to be either due to the differences in sinusoidal pressure / shear stress and flow per gram remaining tissue, or due to differences in the amount of portal hepatotrophic substances delivered to the remnant. This was further

investigated by constructing an aortoportal shunt from the aorta to the left portal vein, selectively increasing the flow to segments II, III and IV to the same flow levels as that seen after a 75 % PHx (2.89 ml/gram/minute). The investigators observed that these segments remained unchanged over three weeks, whilst the right side of the liver, receiving only portal blood in the same period, hypertrophied. The augmented flow seemed to inactivate the hyperperfused segments, as was reflected in the general down-regulation of transcriptional activity (according to microarray analysis). This suggested once more that increased flow in itself is not an adequate stimulus to trigger either hypertrophy or hyperplasia of the liver – the flow must be of splanchnic origin [48]. At the same time, the importance of the remnant perfusate quality (versus quantity) was further illustrated by Ladurner et al who performed a 75 % PHx in pigs assigning one group to receive a side-to-side portosystemic H-shunt decompressing the portal system. As expected, the portal vein flow (to the liver remnant) in the H-shunt group was significantly lower than in animals without the shunt. However, the livers in both groups showed no differences in regenerative response [49], again providing evidence in support for the dominant stimulatory role of portal blood constituents.

To conclude, the flow theory seems again less credible although the optimal amount of portal and sinusoidal flow in the liver remnant seems to be undetermined. However, what is established, is the damage caused by too much sinusoidal flow, as observed in the clinical scenarios of what has been termed the small-for-size syndrome [3]. Could it be that this syndrome is not only the result of the well-recognised sinusoidal congestion and endothelial damage, but also due to the lack of liver regeneration? If so, this would indirectly be an argument for the role of the flow theory. The observation of the fact that GRWR < 0.8% predisposes to SFSS has resulted in the assumption that portal hyperperfusion is the main culprit as the flow per gram liver tissue through the liver sinusoids increases to a harmful level. Evidence that this is the case is seen in preclinical large animal models with portal vein

decompression by portosystemic shunting in transplantation of small-for-size grafts [50-55]

and in combined models of hepatectomy with marginal liver remnants and portosystemic

shunting [56,57]. Portal vein decompression, a normalisation of the portal vein pressure and

portal flow improves liver regeneration. This has been confirmed in clinical (human) studies

[58-61]. As a decrease in portal inflow results in a reciprocal increase in the hepatic artery

flow due to the Hepatic Arterial Buffer Response [62], one could speculate that one of the

reasons for the improved graft function and regeneration with portosystemic shunting is the

increased oxygen tension in the regenerating liver, which brings us to the next topic.

The importance of oxygen- and energy status in the liver

In a canine Eck fistula model in 1952, Cohn et al observed that arterialisation of the portal

vein stump over 4 months prevented liver atrophy [10]. The oxygen tension in the hepatic

veins was similar to control groups, indicating a pronounced oxygen extraction by the liver

deprived of its portal blood supply. Consequent long term canine experiments performed the

next ten years in animals with Eck fistula and portal vein stump arterialisation showed that

this altered hepatic vascularity was compatible with life, although many reported the

development of vascular damage, and liver fibrosis progressing to cirrhosis [11,12,14-16].

However, in 1954, Fisher et al did report superior liver regeneration in dogs after a 42 % PHx

model with Eck fistula and arterialisation of the portal vein stump (controls regenerated to 80

% of original volume versus 103 % in the arterialised group) and hypothesized that the

increased oxygen delivery (and preserved flow) contributed to this difference [13].

Furthermore, in 1967 Mito et al observed growth of a partial heterotopic homograft

arterialised with an aortoportal shunt (grading the pressure in the shunt to 25-35 mmHg by a

Teflon cuff) over a period of 16 days. Notably, this occurred despite the fact that the native

liver received all the portal flow [63]. In 1975, Horak et al also observed similar protective

effects of portal vein arterialisation in Eck fistula dogs over a period of 10 weeks (also grading the arterial shunt flow with flow probes to equal the flow in the portal vein before establishment of the Eck fistula) [64] and recently, Ott el al observed increased regeneration of the porcine liver remnant after PHx upon portal vein arterialisation compared to pigs with portal perfusion of the liver remnant [65]. Not all investigators have reported beneficial effects of portal vein arterialisation though: Marchioro et al observed that the arterialised side of the liver atrophied after 60 days in a canine model of split portocaval transposition and portal vein branch arterialisation [23]. This, however, was in conjunction with undisturbed portal flow to the contra lateral side of the liver which hypertrophied; in effect, taking over the liver function (not unlike the "parenchymal shift" described by Rous and Larimore 47 years earlier [17]).

In the clinical setting, portal vein arterialization has been found useful in counteracting the portoprival state of the liver and hepatic encephalopathy in cirrhotic patients with Eck fistula [66,67], but later experiences with portal vein arterialization of liver grafts has varied from being problematic due to histological changes of microsteatosis and fibrosis (Charco), to unproblematic in other series with good long term liver function (Erhard J, Lange R, Giebler R et al. Arterialization of the portal vein in *American Journal of Transplantation* 2001; 1: 146±151 151 orthotopic and auxiliary liver transplantation. Transplantation 1995; 27:)

How can we explain the apparent beneficial short-term effects of portal vein arterialisation on regeneration and liver homeostasis and what is the relevance to the research on liver regeneration? As obvious as it may seem, rodent models of PHx from the 1970's and canine models from the 1990's have shown that the capacity of the liver remnant to regenerate after PHx is dependant upon an increased supply of energy [68-70]. After PHx in rats, Yoshioka et al showed that oxygen supply to the liver increases by increased hepatic artery flow. Simultaneously, the hepatic oxygen extraction rate increases, while the total energy load

decreases along with increased DNA synthesis [71]. Arterialisation of the liver remnant leads to improved survival in rats after extended hepatectomy [72-74], and this has also been shown to be beneficial in humans after extended hepatectomy [75]. In investigating the mechanisms behind SFSS, Smyrniotis et al studied the hemodynamic changes in different sized liver grafts in pigs finding that while the portal pressure and flow per gram liver increased inversely with graft size, the hepatic artery flow decreased. However, the hepatic arterial buffer response was preserved, even showing an increased response with decreasing graft size [76]. One could therefore hypothesize that a graded portal vein arterialisation could prove beneficial for the function and regeneration of the marginal liver remnant and the small-for-size liver graft, as arterialisation potentially leads to an optimal oxidative status and energy charge in the hepatocytes. Accordingly, a surgical model of extended hepatectomy with arterialisation of the functionally small and deficient remnant with observations of energy charge and histological signs of regeneration could cast light on this aspect and potentially be used as a bridge to complete regeneration in patients with small-for-size grafts. To avoid the deleterious effects of long-term arterialisation in the patient, the end-to-side shunt should be embolised upon completed liver regeneration or normalisation of liver function.

The liver as a source of growth factors in liver regeneration

The preceding sections have focused on how liver homeostasis and regeneration is influenced by the amount, pressure and the composition of its blood supply and drainage. But the liver itself is also a source of growth factors and cytokines which play a vital role in regeneration. In 1939 Brues et al found that a liver extract from adult and embryonic porcine livers would inhibit growth cultured fibroblasts, the process being reversible suggesting that the liver was a source of growth inhibition [77]. However, in 1952, Glinos and Gey found the serum of

partially hepatectomized rats to exert a growth-promoting action on fibroblasts in tissue culture [78]. Around the same time, Bucher and Wenneker reported an increased number of mitoses in the non-hepatectomized partner in parabiotic rats with cross circulation indicating the presence of growth stimulating factors in the effluent from the liver remnant [79,80]. This hypothesis was corroborated in *in-vivo* rodent models by several investigators who observed increased liver cell mitosis in intact animals injected with serum from hepatectomized counterparts [81,82]. To circumvent the changes in portal hemodynamics caused by PHx, Siegel conducted canine experiments in the early1960's with autotransplanting small liver grafts to the jejunal mesentery, later randomizing the animals to a 70 % PHx of the native liver. In contrast to control groups, the autografts in the animals with 70 % PHx did not undergo atrophy, indicating again a growth stimulus from the resected liver to the autografts via the systemic circulation [83]. Similarly, another experiment showed that autografts transplanted to the neck, did not undergo atrophy, tentatively stimulated by the native liver manipulated with an Eck fistula (in contrast to animals without an Eck fistula) [84]. Thomford showed similar results in 1965 in dogs with heterotop allografts, where the grafts did not suffer from atrophy when the native liver, receiving all the portal blood, was resected; again indicating a growth stimulating effect from the liver effluent after PHx [21]. 14 years later Starzl extracted cytosol from hepatectomized canine livers (48 and 72 hours after PHx) injecting it into the portal vein stump of Eck fistula dogs observing a proliferative response [85]. A year later it was observed that the growth-stimulating factor in the cytosol extract from regenerating canine livers (termed Hepatic Stimulatory Substance, SS) was organ specific in that it did not stimulate any glomerular proliferative activity when injected into the renal artery. Additionally, it was found that SS was not found in the liver extracts from animals that underwent splanchninc evisceration synchronously with PHx indicating that its synthesis in the liver probably was a result of splanchninc "collaboration" [86]. Investigating

how factors in the recipient liver influenced the action of SS, Terblanche injected regenerative liver extract into the portal vein perfusing normal canine livers without any response. However, an augmented proliferative response was seen upon injecting the extract into the portal vein of the liver remnants 48 and 72 hours after PHx [87]. Further investigations of possible growth stimulatory substances in the liver effluent from partially hepatectomized pigs were performed by van Hoorn-Hickman in 1981 by cross circulation with recipient animals or exchange perfusion. Increased thymidine kinase activity and mitotic indices in biopsies from portocavally shunted (recipient) pigs corroborated Starzl's previous observations in dogs [88]. Kahn also showed in 1982 that a stimulatory substance was transferred from a transplanted partially hepatectomized liver to the host liver (which had a portocaval shunt), stimulating a proliferative response in the latter (as judged by increased thymidine kinase activity and mitotic indices). The authors speculated whether this phenomenon could be clinically useful in aiding liver regeneration in the host liver in patients with liver failure treated by auxiliary liver grafting [89]. This theory leads to the speculation of whether the development of an acute or acute-upon-chronic liver failure large animal model could be used to test the benefit of injecting serum extracts of liver hepatotrophic substances from resected livers in aiding the regeneration of the damaged liver? Is it possible that the remnant liver after an extensive liver resection could be aided in regeneration by infusion of a concentrate of the patients own serum in the portal vein and could a small-for-size graft procured from living donor split-liver-grafting profit or in some way be supported by the stimulus that the serum of the donor could offer?

What has happened the last two decades and has it helped our patients?

During the last 20 years the focus of research on liver regeneration after PHx has turned from examining extrinsic hepatic factors such as portal- and hepatic arterial blood flow and its content, to the intrinsic consequences these changes have in the extracellular matrix, the intracellular signal transduction mechanisms and genetic response in the liver. Studies in various cell culture models, rodent knockout- and knockdown models, stem cell transplantation, microarray analysis in rodent and porcine models, the impact of the immune system, blood platelets and serotonin, the complement system, cytokines, and the interaction between the many different cell types now known to regulate the regenerative process have all unquestionably added much knowledge to the research on liver regeneration. However, these studies have at the same time, made the picture complex and seemingly increasingly intangible when it comes to the clinical application of the knowledge gained.

Extensive reviews of the vast amount of more contemporary published literature on the molecular control of liver regeneration in the past 20-30 years have been written by authorities on liver research and require mention here. In 2004 Taub outlined the "cytokine" and "growth-factor" pathways eventually leading to the activation of downstream intracellular signalling substances promoting cell cycle entry and mitosis, and the (relatively few number of) molecules arresting liver growth, maintaining a constant liver/body mass. The review concludes that what remains unclear is how the size of the liver is determined, "how the known molecular pathways necessary for liver regeneration are altered in human disease", and that "greater insight will be required to develop improved pharmacological therapeutics and surgical approaches". There is no mention of any clinical application of the knowledge gained so far [90]. In Fausto's 2006 review on research in liver regeneration the author also describes the "cytokine" and "growth-factor" pathways and their interaction and additionally,

the influence of metabolic stimuli in regeneration. The author concludes that the study of liver regeneration affords a unique model to study signal transduction mechanisms and cell cycle events and emphasizes the importance of understanding the process of liver regeneration for the appropriate management of acute liver failure and liver cirrhosis. He ads that what is needed is a more "rigorous effort to apply the knowledge gained in experimental work to solve clinical problems". However, the review does not mention if and how all this scientific work has resulted in a single therapeutic procedure [91]. In his published Rous-Whipple Award Lecture from 2010, Michalapoulos summarizes the control of liver regeneration by the so-called "complete mitogens" that are mitogenic in hepatocyte cell cultures (Hepatocyte Growth Factor, HGF and receptor c-MET and ligands of the Epidermal Growth Factor receptor (EGF, TGF-alpha, Heparin Binding-EGF, and Amphiregulin), and by "auxiliary mitogens" the ablation of which delay the regeneration process (amongst others, norepinephrine, TNF, IL-&, VEGF, bile acids, serotonin, complement proteins, leptin, FGF1 and 2, and insulin). A redundancy exists in all these different pathways as there seems to be a considerable overlap between the many signalling cascades – blockage of one route is compensated by another, leading to completion of liver regeneration. In this comprehensive review, the author concludes that "liver failure, essentially a failure of regeneration, should be subject to mechanistic analysis based on knowledge already gained on regeneration, and perhaps therapeutic interventions may be designed with impact on human liver disease" [39]. Hence it seems clear that the authors are aware of the gap between basic laboratory investigation and clinical appliance in this field.

The benefits of 133 years of surgical research on liver regeneration

How then has research on liver regeneration in the past 133 years benefited the patient with liver cirrhosis, acute liver failure or liver metastasis? The recognition of the importance of portal blood to liver homeostasis and regeneration was obviously crucial to the pioneers of liver transplantation as they observed how the auxiliary graft would undergo atrophy without portal blood constituent stimulus [18]. The earlier canine and porcine experiments of portal vein arterialisation [10-14,63-65] also illustrated to the transplantation surgeon that the auxiliary graft could be perfused by PVA as an option to leave the hilus of the native liver untouched and also in cases of portal vein thrombosis [92-95]. Could portal vein arterialisation of the small for size graft be an option in the future to avoid the small-for-size syndrome?

Furthermore, as part of the emerging multimodal three-stage treatment of colorectal metastases [2], surgeons may now embolize the portal vein before performing large resections in order to stimulate liver hyperplasia in the remnant to be. By this, one may avoid postoperative liver failure, acknowledging that diverting portal flow away from one side to the other results in the "parenchymal shift" described by Rous and Larimore in 1920 [17].

Conclusion

The surgical principles and practice of preoperative portal vein embolization to induce hyperplasia of the remnant to be after PHx, and portal vein decompression by portosystemic shunting to reduce sinusoidal congestion in the case of SFSS after liver transplantation are well established. Apart from these, there are no novel patient therapies available to aid and augment the process of liver regeneration after extended liver resections, toxic liver insults or in the cirrhotic patient. This is in spite of all the modern technological advancements and the

knowledge gained on the microscopic and molecular aspects of liver regeneration in the past 20-30 years. We suggest that it is time to turn back to the systemic large animal surgical research on liver regeneration as it offers a more integrated, systemic biological understanding of this complex process, and that a more clinically relevant progression could possibly be made with a closer collaboration between the hepatologist, liver surgeon/transplant surgeon and the laboratory scientist.

Reference List

1. Pichlmayr R, Ringe B, Gubernatis G, Hauss J, Bunzendahl H: [Transplantation of a donor liver to 2 recipients (splitting transplantation)--a new method in the further development of segmental liver transplantation]. *Langenbecks Arch Chir* 1988, 373: 127-130.

2. Gonzalez HD, Figueras J: Practical questions in liver metastases of colorectal cancer: general principles of treatment. *HPB (Oxford)* 2007, 9: 251-258.

3. Dahm F, Georgiev P, Clavien PA: Small-for-size syndrome after partial liver transplantation: definition, mechanisms of disease and clinical implications. *Am J Transplant* 2005, 5: 2605-2610.

4. Khan AZ, Morris-Stiff G, Makuuchi M: Patterns of chemotherapy-induced hepatic injury and their implications for patients undergoing liver resection for colorectal liver metastases. *J Hepatobiliary Pancreat Surg* 2009, 16: 137-144.

5. Sen S, Jalan R: The role of the Molecular Adsorbents Recirculating System (MARS) in the management of liver failure. *Perfusion* 2004, 19 Suppl 1: S43-S48.

6. Eck NVK: Concerning ligation of the vena porta. *Voenno-Med Zh* 1877, 130 (English translation: Child, C.G (1953) Eck's fistula. *Surg. Gynecol. Obste*t. 96, 375-376).

7. Hahn M, Massen O, Nencki M, Pavlov J: Die Eck'sche Fistel zwischen der uteren Hohlvene und der Pfortader und Folgen fur den Organismus. *Arch Exp Pathol Pharmakol* 1893, 32: 161-210.

8. Grindlay JH, Bollman JL: Regeneration of the liver in the dog after partial hepatectomy; role of the venous circulation. *Surg Gynecol Obstet* 952, 94: 491-496.

9. CHILD CG, III, BARR D, HOLSWADE GR, HARRISON CS: Liver regeneration following portacaval transposition in dogs. *Ann Surg* 1953, 138: 600-608.

10. COHN R, HERROD C: Some effects upon the liver of complete arterialization of its blood supply. *Surgery* 1952, 32: 214-218.

11. McCREDIE JA, DOGGART JR, WELBOURN RB: Total arterialization of the liver. *Br J Surg* 1957, 45: 83-100.

12. SCHILLING JA, McKEE FW: Late follow-up on experimental hepatic-portal arteriovenous fistulae. *Surg Forum* 1953, 4: 392-397.

13. FISHER B, RUSS C, UPDEGRAFF H, FISHER ER: Effect of increased hepatic blood flow upon liver regeneration. *AMA Arch Surg* 1954, 69: 263-272.

14. RATHER LJ, COHN R: [Some effects upon the liver of complete arterialization of its blood supply. III. Acute vascular necrosis.]. *Surgery* 1953, 34: 207-210.

15. SCHWARTZ SI, MORTON JH, McGOVERN GR: Experimental arterialization of the liver. *Surgery* 1961, 49: 611-617.

16. ZUIDEMA GD, GAISFORD WD, ABELL MR, BRODY TM, NEILL SA, CHILD CG: Segmental portal arterialization of canine liver. *Surgery* 1963, 53: 689-698.

17. Rous P, Larimore LD: RELATION OF THE PORTAL BLOOD TO LIVER MAINTENANCE : A DEMONSTRATION OF LIVER ATROPHY CONDITIONAL ON COMPENSATION. *J Exp Med* 1920, 31: 609-632.

18. STARZL TE, MARCHIORO TL, ROWLANDS DT, Jr., KIRKPATRICK CH, WILSON WE, RIFKIND D *et al.*: IMMUNOSUPPRESSION AFTER EXPERIMENTAL AND CLINICAL HOMOTRANSPLANTATION OF THE LIVER. *Ann Surg* 1964, 160: 411-439.

19. MARCHIORO TL, Porter KA, Brown BI, Faris TD, Herrmann TJ, Sudweeks A *et al.*: The specific influence of nonhepatic splanchnic venous blood flow on the liver. *Surg Forum* 1965, 16: 280-282.

20. Tretbar LL, Beven EG, Hermann RE: Homotransplantation of an auxiliary dog liver into the pelvis; effect of protacaval shunt in the prevention of liver atrophy. *Surg Forum* 1965, 16: 219-221.

21. THOMFORD NR, SHORTER RG, HALLENBECK GA: HOMOTRANSPLANTATION OF THE CANINE LIVER: SURVIVAL AND HISTOLOGY WITH AND WITHOUT AZATHIOPRINE. *Arch Surg* 1965, 90: 527-538.

22. Halgrimson CG, MARCHIORO TL, Faris TD, Porter KA, Peters GN, STARZL TE: Auxiliary liver transplantation: effect of host portacaval shunt. Experimental and clinical observations. *Arch Surg* 1966, 93: 107-118.

23. MARCHIORO TL, Porter KA, Brown BI, Otte JB, STARZL TE: The effect of partial portacaval transposition on the canine liver. *Surgery* 1967, 61: 723-732.

24. MARCHIORO TL, Porter KA, DICKINSON TC, Faris TD, STARZI TE: PHYSIOLOGIC REQUIREMENTS FOR AUXILIARY LIVER HOMOTRANSPLANTATION. *Surg Gynecol Obstet* 1965, 121: 17-31.

25. Price JB, Jr., Takeshige K, Parsa M, Voorhees AB, Jr.: Characteristics of animals maintained without splanchnic portal organs. *Surgery* 1971, 70: 768-777.

26. Price JB, Jr., Takeshige K, Max MH, Voorhees AB, Jr.: Glucagon as the portal factor modifying hepatic regeneration. *Surgery* 1972, 72: 74-82.

27. STARZL TE, Francavilla A, Halgrimson CG, Francavilla FR, Porter KA, Brown TH *et al.*: The origin, hormonal nature, and action of hepatotrophic substances in portal venous blood. *Surg Gynecol Obstet* 1973, 137: 179-199.

28. STARZL TE, Porter KA, Putnam CW: Intraportal insulin protects from the liver injury of portacaval shunt in dogs. *Lancet* 1975, 2: 1241-1242.

29. STARZL TE, Porter KA, Kashiwagi N: Portal hepatotrophic factors, diabetes mellitus and acute liver atrophy, hypertrophy and regeneration. *Surg Gynecol Obstet* 1975, 141: 843-858.

30. STARZL TE, Watanabe K, Porter KA, Putnam CW: Effects of insulin, glucagon, and insuling/glucagon infusions on liver morphology and cell division after complete portacaval shunt in dogs. *Lancet* 1976, 1: 821-825.

31. Duguay LR, Orloff MJ: Role of the pancreas in regulation of liver regeneration in dogs. *Surg Forum* 1977, 28: 387-390.

32. STARZL TE, Porter KA, Francavilla JA, Benichou J, Putnam CW: A hundred years of the hepatotrophic controversy. *Ciba Found Symp* 1977, 111-129.

33. STARZL TE, Francavilla A, Porter KA, Benichou J: The effect upon the liver of evisceration with or without hormone replacement. *Surg Gynecol Obstet* 1978, 146: 524-532.

34. STARZL TE, Francavilla A, Porter KA, Benichou J, Jones AF: The effect of splanchnic viscera removal upon canine liver regeneration. *Surg Gynecol Obstet* 1978, 147: 193-207.

35. Francavilla A, STARZL TE, Porter K, Foglieni CS, Michalopoulos GK, Carrieri G *et al.*: Screening for candidate hepatic growth factors by selective portal infusion after canine Eck's fistula. *Hepatology* 1991, 14: 665-670.

36. Richman RA, Claus TH, Pilkis SJ, Friedman DL: Hormonal stimulation of DNA synthesis in primary cultures of adult rat hepatocytes. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 1976, 73: 3589-3593.

37. Carr BI: Gene expression and mitogenic response of rat hepatocytes to EGF, TGF alpha and angiotensinogen gene products. *Proc Amer Assoc Can res* 1990, 31: 1332.

38. Cruise JL, Houck KA, Michalopoulos GK: Induction of DNA synthesis in cultured rat hepatocytes through stimulation of alpha 1 adrenoreceptor by norepinephrine. *Science* 1985, 227: 749-751.

39. Michalopoulos GK: Liver regeneration after partial hepatectomy: critical analysis of mechanistic dilemmas. *Am J Pathol* 2010, 176: 2-13.

40. Sato Y, Koyama S, Tsukada K, Hatakeyama K: Acute portal hypertension reflecting shear stress as a trigger of liver regeneration following partial hepatectomy. *Surg Today* 1997, 27: 518-526.

41. Niiya T, Murakami M, Aoki T, Murai N, Shimizu Y, Kusano M: Immediate increase of portal pressure, reflecting sinusoidal shear stress, induced liver regeneration after partial hepatectomy. *J Hepatobiliary Pancreat Surg* 1999, 6: 275-280.

42. Hermann C, Zeiher AM, Dimmeler S: Shear stress inhibits H2O2-induced apoptosis of human endothelial cells by modulation of the glutathione redox cycle and nitric oxide synthase. *Arterioscler Thromb Vasc Biol* 1997, 17: 3588-3592.

43. Macedo MP, Lautt WW: Shear-induced modulation of vasoconstriction in the hepatic artery and portal vein by nitric oxide. *Am J Physiol* 1998, 274: G253-G260.

44. Wang HH, Lautt WW: Evidence of nitric oxide, a flow-dependent factor, being a trigger of liver regeneration in rats. *Can J Physiol Pharmacol* 1998, 76: 1072-1079.

45. Schoen JM, Wang HH, Minuk GY, Lautt WW: Shear stress-induced nitric oxide release triggers the liver regeneration cascade. *Nitric Oxide* 2001, 5: 453-464.

46. Schoen JM, Lautt WW: Nitric oxide potentiates C-Fos mRNA expression after 2/3 partial hepatectomy. *Proc West Pharmacol Soc* 2002, 45: 47-48.

47. Mortensen KE, Conley LN, Hedegaard J, Kalstad T, Sorensen P, Bendixen C *et al.*: Regenerative response in the pig liver remnant varies with the degree of resection and rise in portal pressure. *Am J Physiol Gastrointest Liver Physiol* 2008, 294: G819-G830.

48. Mortensen KE: Increased sinusoidal flow is not the primary stimulus to liver regeneration. *Comp Hepatol* 2010, Inn press.

49. Ladurner R, Traub F, Schenk M, Konigsrainer A, Glatzle J: Cellular liver regeneration after extended hepatic resection in pigs. *HPB Surg* 2009, 2009: 306740.

50. Asakura T, Ohkohchi N, Orii T, Koyamada N, Tsukamoto S, Sato M *et al.*: Portal vein pressure is the key for successful liver transplantation of an extremely small graft in the pig model. *Transpl Int* 2003, 16: 376-382.

51. Kelly DM, Demetris AJ, Fung JJ, Marcos A, Zhu Y, Subbotin V *et al.*: Porcine partial liver transplantation: a novel model of the "small-for-size" liver graft. *Liver Transpl* 2004, 10: 253-263.

52. Ku Y, Fukumoto T, Nishida T, Tominaga M, Maeda I, Kitagawa T *et al.*: Evidence that portal vein decompression improves survival of canine quarter orthotopic liver transplantation. *Transplantation* 1995, 59: 1388-1392.

53. Pouyet M, Paquet C, Mechet I, Le Derf Y, Bernard P, Figueiredo P *et al.*: [Hemodynamic tolerance and rapid hypertrophy of a hepatic graft corresponding to less than 30% of the ideal mass in pigs]. *Gastroenterol Clin Biol* 2001, 25: 869-874.

54. Smyrniotis VE, Kostopanagiotou G, Theodoraki K, Gamaletsos E, Kondi-Pafiti A, Mystakidou K *et al.*: Effect of mesocaval shunt on survival of small-for-size liver grafts: experimental study in pigs. *Transplantation* 2003, 75: 1737-1740.

55. Wang HS, Ohkohchi N, Enomoto Y, Usuda M, Miyagi S, Asakura T *et al*.: Excessive portal flow causes graft failure in extremely small-for-size liver transplantation in pigs. *World J Gastroenterol* 2005, 11: 6954-6959.

56. Iida T, Yagi S, Taniguchi K, Hori T, Uemoto S: Improvement of morphological changes after 70% hepatectomy with portocaval shunt: preclinical study in porcine model. *J Surg Res* 2007, 143: 238-246.

57. Ueno S, Kobayashi Y, Kurita K, Tanabe G, Aikou T: Effect of prior portosystemic shunt on early hepatic hemodynamics and sinusoids following 84% hepatectomy in dogs. *Res Exp Med (Berl)* 1995, 195: 1-8.

58. Lo CM, Liu CL, Fan ST: Portal hyperperfusion injury as the cause of primary nonfunction in a small-for-size liver graft-successful treatment with splenic artery ligation. *Liver Transpl* 2003, 9: 626-628.

59. Troisi R, Ricciardi S, Smeets P, Petrovic M, Van Maele G, Colle I *et al*.: Effects of hemi-portocaval shunts for inflow modulation on the outcome of small-for-size grafts in living donor liver transplantation. *Am J Transplant* 2005, 5: 1397-1404.

60. Umeda Y, Yagi T, Sadamori H, Matsukawa H, Matsuda H, Shinoura S *et al*.: Effects of prophylactic splenic artery modulation on portal overperfusion and liver regeneration in small-for-size graft. *Transplantation* 2008, 86: 673-680.

61. Yoshizumi T, Taketomi A, Soejima Y, Ikegami T, Uchiyama H, Kayashima H *et al*.: The beneficial role of simultaneous splenectomy in living donor liver transplantation in patients with small-for-size graft. *Transpl Int* 2008, 21: 833-842.

62. Lautt WW: Mechanism and role of intrinsic regulation of hepatic arterial blood flow: hepatic arterial buffer response. *Am J Physiol* 1985, 249: G549-G556.

63. Mito M, Ackroyd FW, Covelli VH, Eyskens E, Katayama I, McDermott WV, Jr.: Partial heterotopic liver homograft in dogs utilizing portal arterialization. *Ann Surg* 1967, 165: 20-32.

64. Horak W, Gangl A, Funovics J, Grabner G: Effect of portacaval shunt and arterialization of the liver on bile acid metabolism. *Gastroenterology* 1975, 69: 338-341.

65. Ott R, Schuppan D, Tannapfel A, Wittekind C, Erhardt W, Henke J *et al*.: Portal vein arterialisation as a technical option in liver transplantation: impact on function, regeneration, and morphology of the liver following hemihepatectomy in pigs. *Liver Int* 2003, 23: 54-62.

66. Adamsons RJ, Kinkhabwala M, Moskowitz H, Himmelfarb E, Minkowitz S, Lerner B: Portacaval shunt with arterialization of the hepatic portion of the portal vein. *Surg Gynecol Obstet* 1972, 135: 529-535.

67. Maillard JN, Rueff B, Prandi D, Sicot C: Hepatic arterialization and portacaval shunt in hepatic cirrhosis. An assessment. *Arch Surg* 1974, 108: 315-320.

68. Nonami T, Asahi K, Harada A, Nakao A, Takagi H: Effect of hyperdynamic circulatory support on hepatic hemodynamics, oxygen supply and demand after massive hepatectomy. *Surgery* 1991, 109: 277-283.

69. Ozawa K, Takeda H, Yamaoka Y, Nambu H, Kamiyama Y: Adenine nucleotide metabolism in regenerative, atrophic, and necrotizing processes of the liver. *Gastroenterology* 1974, 67: 1225-1230.

70. Yamaoka Y, Ohsawa T, Takasan H, Ozawa K: Energy requirement in regenerative and atrophic processes of the liver in man and other mammals. *Surg Gynecol Obstet* 1974, 139: 234-240.

71. Yoshioka S, Miyazaki M, Shimizu H, Ito H, Nakagawa K, Ambiru S *et al*.: Hepatic venous hemoglobin oxygen saturation predicts regenerative status of remnant liver after partial hepatectomy in rats. *Hepatology* 1998, 27: 1349-1353.

72. Shimizu Y, Miyazaki M, Shimizu H, Ito H, Nakagawa K, Ambiru S *et al*.: Beneficial effects of arterialization of the portal vein on extended hepatectomy. *Br J Surg* 2000, 87: 784-789.

73. Fan YD, Praet M, Van Huysse J, Lelie B, de Hemptinne B: Effects of portal vein arterialization on liver regeneration after partial hepatectomy in the rat. *Liver Transpl* 2002, 8: 146-152.

74. Nardo B, Puviani L, Caraceni P, Pacile V, Bertelli R, Beltempo P *et al*.: Portal vein arterialization for the treatment of post resection acute liver failure in the rat. *Transplant Proc* 2006, 38: 1185-1186.

75. Iseki J, Touyama K, Noie T, Nakagami K, Takagi M, Hakamada K *et al*.: Partial portal arterialization for the prevention of massive liver necrosis following extended pancreatobiliary surgery: experience of two cases. *Surg Today* 1992, 22: 568-571.

76. Smyrniotis V, Kostopanagiotou G, Kondi A, Gamaletsos E, Theodoraki K, Kehagias D *et al*.: Hemodynamic interaction between portal vein and hepatic artery flow in small-for-size split liver transplantation. *Transpl Int* 2002, 15: 355-360.

77. Brues AM, Subbarow Y, Jackson EB, Aub JC: GROWTH INHIBITION BY SUBSTANCES IN LIVER. *J Exp Med* 1940, 71: 423-438.

78. GLINOS AD, GEY GO: Humoral factors involved in the induction of liver regeneration in the rat. *Proc Soc Exp Biol Med* 1952, 80: 421-425.

79. BUCHER NL, SCOTT JF, Aub JC: Regeneration of the liver in parabiotic rats. *Cancer Res* 1951, 11: 457-465.

80. WENNEKER AS, SUSSMAN N: Regeneration of liver tissue following partial hepatectomy in parabiotic rats. *Proc Soc Exp Biol Med* 1951, 76: 683-686.

81. PASCHKIS KE, GODDARD J, CANTAROW A, ADIBI S: Stimulation of growth by partial hepatectomy. *Proc Soc Exp Biol Med* 1959, 101: 184-186.

82. Zimmerman M, Cellozzi E: Stimulation of cell division in normal rat liver by a factor in serum from hepatectomized rats. *Fed Proc , Balt ,* 60 A.D., 19: 139.

83. SIGEL B, ACEVEDO FJ, DUNN MR: The effect of patial hepatectomy on autotransplanted liver tissue. *Surg Gynecol Obstet* 1963, 117: 29-36.

84. SIGEL B, Baldia L, DUNN MR: Studies of liver lobes autotransplanted outside the abdominal cavity. *Surg Gynecol Obstet* 1967, 124: 525-530.

85. STARZL TE, Jones AF, Terblanche J, Usui S, Porter KA, Mazzoni G: Growth-stimulating factor in regenerating canine liver. *Lancet* 1979, 1: 127-130.

86. STARZL TE, Porter KA, Hayashida N, Schechter P, Terblanche J: Further studies on hepatic stimulatory substance (SS) after partial hepatectomy. *J Surg Res* 1980, 29: 471-474.

87. Terblanche J, Porter KA, STARZL TE, Moore J, Patzelt L, Hayashida N: Stimulation of hepatic regeneration after partial hepatectomy by infusion of a cytosol extract from regenerating dog liver. *Surg Gynecol Obstet* 1980, 151: 538-544.

88. Hoorn-Hickman R, Kahn D, Green J, MacLeod HA, Terblanche J: Is there a regeneration stimulator substance in the effluent from perfused partially hepatectomized livers? *Hepatology* 1981, 1: 287-293.

89. Kahn D, Hoorn-Hickman R, McLeod H, Terblanche J: The stimulatory effect of a partially hepatectomized auxiliary graft upon the host liver. Observations on the regenerative response in orthotopic and heterotopic grafts. *S Afr Med J* 1982, 61: 362-365.

90. Taub R: Liver regeneration: from myth to mechanism. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol* 2004, 5: 836-847.

91. Fausto N, Campbell JS, Riehle KJ: Liver regeneration. *Hepatology* 2006, 43: S45-S53.

92. Margarit C, Bilbao I, Charco R, Lazaro JL, Hidalgo E, Allende E *et al.*: Auxiliary heterotopic liver transplantation with portal vein arterialization for fulminant hepatic failure. *Liver Transpl* 2000, 6: 805-809.

93. Erhard J, Lange R, Rauen U, Scherer R, Friedrich J, Pietsch M *et al.*: Auxiliary liver transplantation with arterialization of the portal vein for acute hepatic failure. *Transpl Int* 1998, 11: 266-271.

94. Lange R, Rauen U, Janssen H, Erhard J, de Groot H: Temporary heterotopic auxiliary liver transplantation with arterialization of the portal vein as treatment of acute liver failure. *Transpl Int* 2007, 20: 473-474.

95. Tsivian M, Neri F, Prezzi D, Puviani L, Pacile V, Bertelli R *et al.*: Portal vein arterialization in hepatobiliary surgery and liver transplantation. *Transplant Proc* 2007, 39: 1877-1878.

Table.1 Chronological overwiev

Year	Species	First author	Title	Reference number	Hepatectomy	Liver transplantation	Splanchninc evisceration	Other manipulation	Vascular rearrangement	Portal vein arterialisation	Gene expression	Humoral modell	Metabolic model	Flow modell	Oxygenation and energy status of the liver	The liver as a source of growth factors	Studies in anatomy	Small-for-size syndrome	Studies reporting hemodynamic data	Growth factor detection
					General → **Methods**							**Regeneration model**					**Varia**			
1877	Dog	Eck	Concerning ligation of the vena porta	6				x	x											
1920	Rabitt	Rous	Relation of the portal blood to liver maintenance	17				x	x			x		x	x					
1939	Pig	Brues	Growth inhibition by substances in liver	77				x								x				
1951	Rat	Bucher	Regeneration of the liver in parabiotic rats	79	x			x	x			x				x				
1952	Dog	Cohn	Some effects upon the liver of complete arterialization of its blood supply	10				x	x	x				x	x					
1952	Dog	Grindlay	Regeneration of the liver in the dog after partial hepatectomy. Role of the venous circulation.	8	x			x	x			x	x	x					x	
1953	Dog	Child	Liver regeneration following portocaval transposistion in dogs	9	x			x	x			x								
1953	Dog	Rather	Some effects upon the liver of complete arterialization of its blood supply	14				x	x	x				x			x		x	
1953	Dog	Schilling	Late follow-up on experimental hepatic-portal arteriovenous fistulae.	12				x	x	x				x	x			x	x	
1954	Dog	Fisher	Effect of increased hepatic blood flow upon liver regeneration	13	x			x	x	x				x	x				x	
1957	Dog	McCredie	Total arterialization of the liver	11				x	x	x				x	x				x	
1961	Dog	Schwartz	Experimental arterialization of the liver	15				x	x	x				x	x			x		
1963	Dog	Sigel	The effect of partial hepatectomy on autotransplantated liver tissue	83	x	x		x	x			x				x				
1963	Dog	Zuidema	Segmental portal arterialization of the canine liver	16				x	x	x				x				x	x	
1965	Dog	Marchioro	Physiological requirements for auxiliary liver homotransplantation	24	x	x	x	x	x			x								
1965	Dog	Marchioro	The specific influence of nonhepatic splanchnic venous blood flow on the liver	19				x	x			x								
1965	Dog	Sigel	Tritiated Thymidine autoradiography in the regenerating liver of the dog		x															
1965	Dog	Thomford	Homotransplantation of the canine liver	21	x	x		x	x			x				x				
1965	Dog	Tretbar	Homtransplantation of an auxiliary dog liver into the pelvis - effect of portocaval shunt in the prevention of liver atrophy	20		x		x	x			x								
1966	Dog	Halgrimson	Auxiliary liver transplantation: effect of host portocaval shunt	22		x		x	x			x								
1967	Dog	Marchioro	The effect of partial portocaval transposition on the canine liver	23				x	x	x		x	x	x	x				x	
1967	Dog	Mito	Partial heterotopic liver homograft in dogs utilizing portal arterialization	63		x		x	x	x				x	x			x	x	
1967	Dog	Sigel	Indenpendence of hyperplastic and hypertrophic responses in liver regeneration		x	x		x	x			x				x				
1967	Dog	Sigel	Studies of liver autotransplanted outside the abdominal cavity	84		x		x	x	x		x	x	x						
1971	Dog	Price	Characteristics of animals maintained without splanchnic portal organs	25			x	x	x			x								
1972	Dog	Price	Glucagon as the portal factor modifying hepatic regeneration	26	x		x		x	x		x								
1973	Dog	Starzl	The origin, hormonal nature, and activation of hepatotrophic substances in portal venous blood	27				x	x			x								
1974	Dog	Starzl	Intraportal insulin protects from the liver injury of portacaval shunt in dogs	28				x	x			x								
1975	Dog	Horak	Effect of portacaval shunt and arterialization of the liver on bile acid metabolism	64				x	x	x				x					x	
1975	Dog	Starzl	Portal hepatotrofic factors, diabetes mellitus and acute liver atrophy, hypertrophy and regeneration	29	x		x	x	x			x								
1976	Dog	Dugay	Regulation of liver regeneration by the pancreas in dogs		x		x	x				x								
1976	Pig	Gallot	A simplified blodless procedure for extensive hepatectomy		x				x								x			
1976	Ape	Putnam	Hepatic encephalopathy and light eletron micrographic canges of the baboon liver after portal division					x												
1976	Dog	Starzl	Effects of insulin, glucagon and insulin/glucagon infusions on liver morphology and cell division after complete portacaval shunt in dogs	30				x	x			x								
1977	Pig	Campdrodon	Intrahepatic Vascular Division in the Pig		x												x			
1977	Dog	Duguay	Role of the pancreas in regulatoin of liver regeneration in dogs	31	x		x					x								
1978	Dog	Francavilla	Liver regeneration in dogs: morphologic and chemical changes		x								x							
1978	Dog	Starzl	The effect of splanchnic removal upon canine liver regeneration	34			x			x		x								
1978	Dog	Starzl	The effect upon the liver of evisceration with or without hormone replacement	33	x		x					x								
1979	Dog	Starzl	Growth-stimulating factor in regenerating canine liver	85				x	x							x				

		General			Methods							Regeneration model					Varia			
Year	Species	First author	Title	Reference number	Hepatectomy	Liver transplantation	Splanchninc evisceration	Other manipulation	Vascular rearrangement	Portal vein arterialisation	Gene expression	Humoral modell	Metabolic model	Flow modell	Oxygenation and energy status of the liver	The liver as a source of growth factors	Studies in anatomy	Small-for-size syndrome	Studies reporting hemodynamic data	Growth factor detection
1980	Pig	Kahn	Thymidine Kinase: An inexpensive Indes of Liver Regeneration in a large Aninmal Model		x															
1980	Dog	Starzl	Further studies on hepatic simulatory substance (SS) after partial hepatectomy	86	x		x		x							x				
1980	Dog	Terblanche	Stimulation of hepatic regeneration after partial hepatectomy by infusion of a cytosol extract from regenerating dog liver	87	x			x								x				
1981	Pig	Van Hoorn-Hickn	Is there a regeneration stimulator substance in the effluent from perfused partially hepatectomized livers?	88	x				x							x				
1982	Pig	Kahn	The stimulatory effect of a partially hepatectomized auxiliary graft upon the host liver	89	x	x		x	x							x				
1984	Pig	Kahn	Liver Blood Flow after Partial Hepatectomy in the Pig		x														x	
1985	Pig	Nordlinger	High-yield preparation of porcine hepatocytes for long survival after transplantation in the spleen			x														
1987	Dog	Francavilla	Extraction and partial purification of a hepatic stimulatory substance in rats, mice, and dogs		x							x				x				x
1987	Dog	Kam	Evidence that host size determines liver size:studies in dogs receiving ortotopic liver transplants			x							x							
1988	Pig	Kahn	A Porcine Model for the Study of Liver Regeneration		x															
1988	Pig	Kahn	Partial Hepatectomy and Liver Regeneration in Pigs. The Response to different Resection Sizes		x															
1988	Pig	Kahn	Hepatic stimulator substance in extracts from regenerating porcine liver		x											x				x
1991	Dog	Francavilla	Screening for candidate hepatic growth factors by selective portal infusion after canine Eck's fistula	35				x	x			x								x
1991	Dog	Nonami	Effect of hyperdynamic circulatory support on hepatic hemodynamics, oxygen supply and demand after massive hepatectomy	68	x				x						x				x	
1995	Dog	Ku	Evidence that portal vein decompression improves survival of canine quarter orthotopic liver transplantation	52	x			x	x					x				x	x	
1995	Dog	Ueno	Effect of prior portosystemic shunt on early hemodynamics and sinusoids following 84% hepatectomy in dogs	57	x				x									x		
1995	Pig	Yanaga	Partial hepatic grafting: porcine study on critical volume reduction		x	x												x		
1997	Pig	Chow	Serial Ultrasound-Guided percutaneous Liver Biopsy in a Partial Hepatectomy Porcine Model: A New Technique in the Study of Liver Regeneration		x															
1997	Dog	Ogata	Short-term effect of portal vein arterialization on hepatic protein synthesis and endotoxemia after extended hepatectomy in dogs		x				x	x				x				x	x	
1997	Rat	Sato	Acute portal hypertension reflecting shear stress as a trigger of liver regeneration following partial hepatectomy	40	x									x					x	
1998	Cat	Macedo	Shear-induced modulation of vasoconstriction in the hepatic artery and portal vein by nitric oxide	43				x	x					x					x	
1998	Rat	Wang	Evidence of nitric oxide, a flow-dependant factor, being a trigger of liver regeneration in rats	44	x									x					x	
1998	Rat	Yoshioka	Hepatic venous hemoglobin oxygen saturation predicts regenerative status of remnant liver after partial hepatectomy in rats	71	x										x					
1999	Pig	Sun	Liver regeneration after partial hepatectomy is non-uniform: flow cytometric bromodeoxyuridine incorporation and cell cycle studies in a porcine model		x											x	x			
1999	Dog	Yabe	Portal blood flow and liver regeneration in auxiliary partial orthotop liver transplantation in a canine model		x	x			x			x				x				
1999	Rat	Niiya	Immediate increase of portal pressure, reflecting sinusoidal shear stress, induced liver regeneration after partial hepatectomy	41	x				x					x					x	
2000	Pig	Calise	Intrasplenic hepatocyte transplantation in the pig: new technical aspects		x							x				x				
2000	Pig	Lai	Changes in prostaglandin and nitric oxide levels in the hyperdynamic circulation following liver resection		x														x	
2000	Rat	Shimizu	Beneficial effects of arterialization of the portal vein on extended hepatectomy	72	x									x						
2001	Dog	Pouyet	Hemodynamic tolerance and rapid hypertrophy of a hepatic graft corresponding to less than 30% of the ideal mass in pigs	53		x		x	x			x		x				x	x	
2001	Rat	Schoen	Shear stress-induced nitric oxide release triggers the regeneration cascade	45	x									x					x	

General					Methods							Regeneration model					Varia			
Year	Species	First author	Title	Reference number	Hepatectomy	Liver transplantation	Splanchninc evisceration	Other manipulation	Vascular rearrangement	Portal vein arterialisation	Gene expression	Humoral modell	Metabolic model	Flow modell	Oxygenation and energy status of the liver	The liver as a source of growth factors	Studies in anatomy	Small-for-size syndrome	Studies reporting hemodynamic data	Growth factor detection
2002	Pig	Alvira	Influence of Cyclosporine on Graft regeneration and Function After Liver Transplantation: trial in Pigs			x														
2002	Pig	Smyrniotis	Hemodynamic interaction between portal vein and hepatic artery flow in small-for-size split transplantation	76		x								x	x			x	x	
2002	Rat	Schoen	Nitric oxide potentiates C-Fos mRNA expression after 2/3 partial hepatectomy	46	x									x					x	
2002	Rat	Fan	Effects of portal vein arterialization on liver regeneration after partial hepatectomy in the rat	73	x			x	x	x				x						
2003	Pig	Asakura	Portal vein pressure is the key for successful liver transplantation of an extremely small graft in the pig model	50		x			x					x				x		
2003	Pig	Court	Segmental nature of the porcine liver and its potential as a model for experimental partial hepatectomy														x			
2003	Pig	Ishiguro	Auxiliary Partial Orthotopic Liver Transplatation for Fulminant Hepatitis: Regeneration of the Diseased native liver in Pig Model			x														
2003	Pig	Mahlati	The regenerative response in intact young livers grafted into different sized recipient pigs			x						x								
2003	Pig	Ott	Portal vein arterialisation as a technical option in liver transplantation: impact on function, regeneration, and morphology of the liver following hemihepatectomy in pigs	65	x				x	x				x	x			x		
2003	Pig	Smyrniotis	Effect of mesocaval shunt on survival of small-for-size liver grafts: experimental srudy in pigs	54		x		x	x					x				x	x	
2004	Pig	Court	Subtotal Hepatectomy: A Porcine Model for the Study of Liver Regeneration		x															
2004	Pig	Kelly	Porcine Partial Liver Transplantation: A Novel Model of the "Small-For-Size" Liver Graft	51		x								x				x		
2005	Pig	Ladurner	Extended Liver Resection and Hepatic Ischemia in Pigs: A New, Potentially Reversible Model to Induce Acute Liver Failure and Study Artifi cial Liver Support Systems		x				x											
2005	Pig	Wang	Excessive portal flow causes graft failure in extremely small-for-size liver transplantation in pigs	55		x			x					x				x		
2005	Rat	Nardo	Portal vein arterialization for the treatment of post resection acute liver failure in the rat	74	x			x	x	x				x						
2007	Pig	Knubben	A new surgical model for hepatectomy in pigs		x				x								x			
2007	Pig	Lida	Improvement of Morphological Changes after 70% Hepatectomy with Portocaval Shunt: Preclinical Study in Porcine Model	56	x				x					x				x		
2007	Pig	Piecuch	Liver Regeneration following portal blood arterialization and splenectomy in acute hepatic failure							x					x					
2007	Pig	Pouyet	Liver regeneration and hemodynamics in pigs with mesocaval shunt		x				x			x		x						
2007	Pig	Wege	Regeneration in pig livers by compensatory hyperplasia induces high levels of telomerase activity		x															
2008	Pig	Kano	Differentially expressed genes in a porcine adult hepatic stem-like cell line and their expression in developing and regenerating liver		x						x									
2008	Pig	Mortensen	Regenerative response in the pig liver remnant varies eith the degree of resection and rise in portal pressure	47	x						x		x	x					x	
2008	Pig	Xia	Extended hepatectomy with segments I and VII as resection remnant: a simple model for small.for-size injuries in pigs		x												x	x		
2009	Pig	Ladurner	Cellular LiverRegeneration after Extended Hepatic Resection in Pigs	49	x				x			x	x	x						
2009	Pig	Liska	Interleukin-6 Augments Activation of Liver regeneration in Porcine Model of Partial Portal Vein Ligation						x			x				x				
2010	Pig	Mortensen	Increased sinusoidal flow is not the primary stimulus to liver regeneration	48				x	x	x	x	x	x	x					x	