Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a good idea to help assess regression of NAFLD. However, some issues need to be clarified: 1. The authors should specify the diagnostic criteria for NAFLD. Was ultrasound the only diagnostic test in this study? 2. The authors suggested that FIB4<1.45 identified no fibrosis, FIB4>2.67 identified fibrosis. How about the value between 1.45 and 2.67? 3. The authors suggested that APRI<0.5 identified fibrosis, APRI >1.5 identified fibrosis. How about the value between 0.5 and 1.5? 4. The results of liver fibrosis assessment of FIB4 and APRI are different (3.7% vs 16.6%). Why didn't the authors choose a more accurate method? 5. The number of studied patients was too small (57) and the assessment method for liver fibrosis was not accurate. So the results were not convincing enough.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Hepatology*

Manuscript NO: 75856

Title: Prevalence of Sarcopenia by different methods in patients with Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05261046

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2022-03-17

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-04-08 00:47

Reviewer performed review: 2022-04-16 19:43

Review time: 8 Days and 18 Hours

Scientific quality	[　] Grade A: Excellent　[Y] Grade B: Very good　[　] Grade C: Good [　] Grade D: Fair　[　] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[　] Grade A: Priority publishing　[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [　] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing　[　] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[　] Accept (High priority)　[　] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision　[　] Major revision　[　] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes　[　] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Interesting study, well written worth publishing. Limited literature on sacropenia as it pertains to liver disease patients.   There are some typing errors. For example, under discussion in the first paragraph, you write "simple" instead of "sample."