PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 66199

Title: Influencing factors for hepatic fat accumulation in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus

Reviewer's code: 05040165

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Thailand

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-24

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-24 07:44

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-24 11:10

Review time: 3 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] 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

The title of the article is "Analysis of influencing factors for hepatic fat accumulation diagnosed by MR mDIXON-Quant imaging in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus". The authors conducted a cross-sectional study was carried out among the T2DM patients hospitalized in the endocrinology department of the first affiliated hospital of Soochow University from January 2017 to March 2018(Suzhou, China). This study aimed to investigate the influencing factors for hepatic fat accumulation in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM). It sounds interesting, however, there are some concerns that need to be addressed. I have the following comments, 1. For the multivariate analysis, please clarify the methods for variables selection in model. The association or casual inference is their aim the confounding factors according to previous knowledge should be included to the model for appropriate effect estimation. A stepwise selection might not appropriate for the variable selection. The collinearity and goodness-of-fit analysis should be performed and show in the results. For variable and model selection, please refer to these articles: I. Heinze G, Wallisch C, Dunkler D. Variable selection - A review and recommendations for the practicing statistician. Biometrical J [Internet]. 2018 May 1 [cited 2020 Oct 22];60(3):431–49. Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC5969114/?report=abstract II. VanderWeele TJ. Principles of confounder selection. Eur J Epidemiol [Internet]. 2019 Mar 15 [cited 2020 Oct 22];34(3):211–9. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10654-019-00494-6 2. Please provide flowchart of participants. Additionally, include full details of how the authors handled missing data and outliers in the 'Methods' section. 3. In "Methods" part, how the authors selected baseline characteristics and laboratory values for included in analysis? 4. There are a lot of typos and grammatical errors that should be checked carefully and corrected throughout the manuscript.

**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 66199

Title: Influencing factors for hepatic fat accumulation in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus

Reviewer's code: 05040165

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Thailand

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-24

Reviewer chosen by: Man Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-29 10:08

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-29 13:20

Review time: 3 Hours

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

My previous concerns had adequate addressed. Overall quality of this manuscripts has improved significantly. I have no additional comments.