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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This reviewer should congratulate authors for approaching this interesting topic. Some suggestions to let readers have a broader view of the issue. The key point is this..... a study showed that women with NAFLD lost the protective effect that women have against cardiovascular disease...thus the hormonal factor seems to play a reduced role. Authors are requested to comment on this aspect. Could glucocorticoids have some effects in sexual dimorphism, at the light of their key role in pathogenesis of NAFDL, as evident in..World J Gastroenterol. 2013 Oct 28; 19(40): 6735–6743. Authors should speculate on this alternative Hypothesis
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for this well-prepared review. It deserves publication. I want to raise a few points. 1- MAFLD has not been fully replaced with NAFLD completely. There is still a debate on the subject. NAFLD is still being used. (https://easl.eu/event/digital-nafld-summit-2021/) Actually MAFLD has many advantages, but Lean-NAFLD cases without any metabolic disturbances are not covered by this replacement. Maybe non-MAFLD will be used instead of lean NAFLD without MAFLD. So adding "NAFLD with metabolic criteria" will justify the issue still under debate. 2- A typographic error "Kupfer" to "Kupffer" 3- "some people believe that " sentence needs citation.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The authors present a review on the gender differences in the pathogenesis, epidemiology and clinical course of MAFLD. It is an interesting topic, with potentially clinical impact, for which I commend the authors. However, I think the manuscript needs major rewriting, in order to be easier to read and to convey a more clear message. The organization is a bit confusing. For example, it is not clear the difference of chapters pathogenesis and pathophysiology. I believe both words have similar meaning. The chapter on hepatocellular carcinoma is particularly confusing. The abstract should be completely reviewed. For example, it is not logic to say that men have more severe fibrosis, but women have faster fibrosis progression. Also, what do the authors mean when stating that men benefit more from treatment, what treatment? Furthermore, the sentence “the development and prognosis are worse among women than among men” is difficult to interpret, since before the authors said before men had higher prevalence of MAFLD and advanced fibrosis. MAFLD is not exactly the same as NAFLD. Also, MAFLD does not manifest as NAFLD or NASH. It could be said MAFLD manifests as simple steatosis or steatohepatitis with different degrees of liver fibrosis.