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Reviewer’s report:

the difference among muscle mass indices and most ideal index in measuring relative muscle mass is a valuable topic in research about sarcopenia, and the authors try to compare the differences between several indices. However, there are several critical issues that should be further addressed.

1) Introduction/Background: The authors did not mention about ALM/ BMI that had been newly proposed by FNIH project. The authors did not mention the ALM / BMI proposed in the FNIH project. In addition, the authors should give more details about previously published data on clinical differences between parameters and why authors attempted to compare the indicators.

2) The author refers to the muscle mass parameter ASM, but it is ALM, not ASM. Correct the entire document.

3) Results: The authors described the results too short. The meaningful results in the tables should be explained in more detail in the results session.

4) Results: What is the coincidence rate of the lowest quintile among each variables in men and women?

5) Results and conclusions are not well connected. In the results, ASM / BMI provided good correlation with mortality as similar to ASM in the crude model, but ASM / BMI is not mentioned at the conclusion and in the discussion part. The authors should present more meaningful results in detail and conclusions should be drawn accordingly.

4) The authors should indicate the mean value and SDs of each muscle mass index in men and women in table 1.
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