

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Diabetes*

**Manuscript NO:** 89342

**Title:** Predictive value of angiotensin-like protein 8 in metabolic dysfunction-associated fatty liver disease and its progression: A case-control study

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05531699

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-10-28

**Reviewer chosen by:** Yu-Lu Chen

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-12-15 09:54

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-12-16 17:37

**Review time:** 1 Day and 7 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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

Here, the Authors present and comment the results of a well conducted study exploring explore the value of ANGPTL8 for predicting MAFLD and its progression. My main comment is: what could be the actual relevance of ANGPTL8 for clinical practice? to my knowledge, this is not a routine test and it requires specialized equipment. can the Authors comment on this? Two minor comments, in terms of style:

- there is no need, in my opinion, to report a sentence like the following: Among the 160 patients, 80 patients were diagnosed with MAFLD, and 80 patients did not have MAFLD. it would better read as "Among the 160 patients, 80 patients (50%) were diagnosed with MAFLD". this can apply to several other sentences in the Results.
- there is no need to state  $p>0.05$  if a comparison is not significant. Better to report the actual p-value instead.