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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for letting me review the present article titled "Measuring liver fat fraction with complex-based chemical shift MRI: the effect of simplified sampling protocols on accuracy."

Since this is the revised version, I will discuss only the remaining problem.

1. In the letter from the author, they claimed as below.

" Indeed, they are often used (e.g. see new reference 29) without any reference made to the 'normality' of the underlying data. Additionally, I cannot find any mainstream references that suggest that the type of ICC we have employed "absolute intraclass correlation coefficients for single measures" assumes observations to be normally distributed."

The new reference the author listed is a radiology article that is using ICC without checking the normality of the data.

I really hate scientists to act as if "There's safety in numbers." Why not check the statistical articles?

To use a specific method properly, author should check the classic and essential paper of the method, not the papers using the method.

Please read a basic article as Psychol Bull. 1979 Mar;86(2):420-8. By understanding the article, I think the author can agree to use the non-parametric test as Spearman's rank correlation coefficient and not ICC.

Since the correlation seems to be very good, I think that the result would not be changed even if you change the statistical testing.

Otherwise, I think the author has made satisfactory revision against the reviewers' comments.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No
Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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