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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
1. Are there controversies in this field? What are the most recent and important achievements in the field? In my opinion, answers to these questions should be emphasized. Perhaps, in some cases, novelty of the recent achievements should be highlighted by indicating the year of publication in the text of the manuscript.  
2. The results and discussion section is very weak and no emphasis is given on the discussion of the results like why certain effects are coming in to existence and what could be the possible reason behind them?  
3. Conclusion: not properly written.  
4. Results and conclusion: The section devoted to the explanation of the results suffers from the same problems revealed so far. Your storyline in the results section (and conclusion) is hard to follow. Moreover, the conclusions reached are really far from what one can infer from the empirical results.  
5. The discussion should be rather organized around arguments avoiding simply describing details without providing much meaning. A real discussion should also link the findings of the study to theory and/or literature.  
6. Spacing, punctuation marks, grammar, and spelling errors should be reviewed thoroughly. I found so many typos throughout the manuscript.  
7. English is modest. Therefore, the
authors need to improve their writing style. In addition, the whole manuscript needs to be checked by native English speakers.
Name of journal: World Journal of Hepatology

Manuscript NO: 88636

Title: Metabolic Puzzle: Exploring Liver Fibrosis Differences in Asian MAFLD Subtypes

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 03538879

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Chief Doctor, Professor

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: China

Author’s Country/Territory: Pakistan

Manuscript submission date: 2023-10-02

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-10-03 02:20

Reviewer performed review: 2023-10-05 02:43

Review time: 2 Days

Scientific quality

[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good
[ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish

Novelty of this manuscript

[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair
[ ] Grade D: No novelty

Creativity or innovation of this manuscript

[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair
[ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</th>
<th>[ Y] Grade A: Excellent</th>
<th>[ ] Grade B: Good</th>
<th>[ ] Grade C: Fair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] Grade D: No scientific significance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language quality</td>
<td>[ Y] Grade A: Priority publishing</td>
<td>[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing</td>
<td>[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>[ ] Accept (High priority)</td>
<td>[ ] Accept (General priority)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ Y] Minor revision</td>
<td>[ ] Major revision</td>
<td>[ ] Rejection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-review</td>
<td>[ Y] Yes</td>
<td>[ ] No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-reviewer statements</td>
<td>Peer-Review: [ Y] Anonymous</td>
<td>[ ] Onymous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes</td>
<td>[ Y] No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This is an interesting study, although the sample size is not sufficient, the single research center is limited, and the accuracy of the examination is insufficient. This study has obtained some useful results, and distinguishing different metabolic comorbidities in MAFLD patients can help predict the progression of liver fibrosis, which is important for reducing liver related mortality in MAFLD patients. Before accepting, the author needs to make the following revisions. 1. The total number of screened patients and the criteria for performing ultrasound diagnosis should be provided, which are important for understanding the prevalence of MAFLD; 2. Most studies suggest that the number of metabolic risk factors is related to age. In this work, the authors reach a different conclusion, has the factor of the age been considered? 3. Two different fibrosis risk prediction models showed different fibrosis risk of lean MAFLD, the authors need to analyze the differences between the two models to give accurate information for lean MAFLD.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Conclusion: not properly written.  
2. Results and conclusion: The section devoted to the explanation of the results suffers from the same problems revealed so far. 
Your storyline in the results section (and conclusion) is hard to follow. Moreover, the conclusions reached are really far from what one can infer from the empirical results.  
3. The discussion should be rather organized around arguments avoiding simply describing details without providing much meaning. A real discussion should also link the findings of the study to theory and/or literature.