



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Hepatology*

Manuscript NO: 85608

Title: Impact of renaming NAFLD to MAFLD in prevalence, characteristics and risk factors :A cross-section study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06270204

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-05-06

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-05-07 07:27

Reviewer performed review: 2023-05-15 18:48

Review time: 8 Days and 11 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Strengths: Large Sample Size: The study includes a large number of participants (85242), increasing the reliability and statistical power of the findings. Comparative Analysis: The comparison between MAFLD and NAFLD presents a comprehensive view of the prevalence and associated factors of these two conditions. Demographic and Clinical Data: The detailed demographic and clinical characteristics of the study population, including BMI, sex, age, and various biochemical parameters, offer a well-rounded understanding of the study population. Multi-faceted Risk Factors: The identification of several risk factors, including socio-demographic, clinical, and lifestyle factors, offers a comprehensive understanding of the associated risks. Weaknesses: Self-Reported Data: Lifestyle information was self-reported by the participants, which could introduce recall bias. Limited Geographical Reach: All subjects were from one medical facility, and the applicability of these findings to other regions or ethnic groups may be limited. Absence of Histological Diagnosis: The use of ultrasound imaging, although practical, is not the gold standard for diagnosis. A histological diagnosis would have provided more precise data. Lack of Discussion on Diagnostic Methods: The



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

study did not explore the differences and advantages of using VCTE (Vibration Controlled Transient Elastography) for the diagnosis of NAFLD or MAFLD compared to other diagnostic methods. Suggested Amendments: The authors should incorporate a discussion on the differences and advantages of using VCTE for diagnosing NAFLD or MAFLD. This is important because VCTE has been shown to provide more accurate diagnosis compared to other diagnostic methods, due to its ability to detect liver stiffness, a key feature of these conditions. Relevant studies to be cited in this regard could include: doi: 10.1016/j.numecd.2023.03.005); doi: 10.3389/fendo.2023.1160625; doi: 10.3389/fimmu.2022.925690); doi: 10.3389/fendo.2022.857110.

In conclusion, while this study has several strengths, particularly in its large sample size and detailed analysis, some areas could be improved, particularly in the discussion of diagnostic methods. By incorporating these changes, the study could provide a more comprehensive understanding of the subject matter.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Hepatology*

Manuscript NO: 85608

Title: Impact of renaming NAFLD to MAFLD in prevalence, characteristics and risk factors :A cross-section study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05270042

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Viet Nam

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-05-06

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-05-23 10:09

Reviewer performed review: 2023-05-30 10:07

Review time: 6 Days and 23 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an elaborate study with a large number of patients. However, some issues need to be clarified: 1. Ultrasound cannot detect mild, moderate, or severe hepatic steatosis. 2. In the opinion of some hepatologists, MAFLD and NAFLD are two different conditions. MAFLD may include viral hepatitis B or C. NAFLD does not include viral hepatitis. 3. The authors should distinguish between chronic renal failure and chronic renal disease. 4. The authors should analyze clearly how SUA, A/G, TBIL are related to chronic renal failure. Patients with chronic renal disease may have elevated SUA levels. 5. The authors divided patients into groups: NAFLD, not NAFLD, MAFLD, not MAFLD. The authors should investigate one more group that includes both NAFLD and MAFLD. 6. In Tables 1 and 2, there were many variables. However, in the discussion, the authors did not mention them.



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Hepatology*

Manuscript NO: 85608

Title: Impact of renaming NAFLD to MAFLD in prevalence, characteristics and risk factors :A cross-section study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05270042

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Viet Nam

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-05-06

Reviewer chosen by: Ji-Hong Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-06-19 09:55

Reviewer performed review: 2023-06-20 10:42

Review time: 1 Day

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I agree to authors' response.