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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you very much for your kindly comments and thoughtful suggestions on our manuscript (BPED-D-18-01024R2).

We have tried our best to revise and improve the manuscript and have made careful modifications to the revised manuscript accordingly. The language of our manuscript have been refined and polished by a professional editing company(American Journal Experts). We hope that the corrections will meet with your approval.

Thank you again for your time and consideration, and we look forward to your positive information about our revised manuscript.

Yours sincerely,

Jing Zeng, Jian-Gao Fan, Li-Su Huang
Below you will find our point-by-point responses to the your comments:

Responses to the editor’s comments:

1. Please see the reviewers’ comments, below.

Response: You would find a point-by-point response below. Thank you very much.

2. Thank you for providing information regarding consent to participate. Please also state in the Methods section that written informed consent was obtained, as this should be stated in both the Methods and Ethics approval sections.

Response: Thank you very much for pointing out this issue. We have added the statement in the Methods section in the revised manuscript. (see Methods section, line 111-113, page 6).

3. In your Funding section, please also state the role of the funding bodies in the design of the study; collection, analysis, and interpretation of data; and in writing the manuscript.

Response: Thank you very much for pointing out this issue. We have added the statement in the Funding section in the revised manuscript. (see Funding section, line 345-351, page 17).

4. At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colors. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files.

Response: Thank you very much for your kindly suggestions.

Responses to the reviewer’s comments:

To Prof. Mi-Jung Lee (Reviewer 1):

1. The authors have dealt with almost my concerns and I am satisfied with their responses.

Response: Thank you very much for your kindly comments and thoughtful suggestions on our manuscript

2. The use of the term for repeatability is still thought to require scientific basis and requires deletion.
Response: Thank you very much for pointing out this issue. We have checked the term for repeatability.

3. I think the conclusion of the abstract is long and there are many unnecessary comments. It would be nice if you could just leave the first sentence and add a 95th percentile value.

Response: We very much appreciate your advice. We have made some corrections according to your instructions in the revised manuscript. (see Abstract section, line 65-69, page 4).

4. Table 3: There is no "a" indicated on the last sentence in the table.

Response: Thank you very much for pointing out this issue. We have made corrections according to your instructions in the revised manuscript. (see Table 3, line 199, page 10).

To Prof. Imeke Goldschmidt (Reviewer 2):

- line 136 please eliminate "were"

Response: Thank you very much for your good suggestion. We have made corrections according to your instructions in the revised manuscript. (see Methods section, line 132, page 6).

- line 166 please eliminate "further"

Response: We have made corrections according to your instructions in the revised manuscript. (see Results section, line 161, page 8).

- line 185 please eliminate "the" before valid

Response: We have made corrections according to your instructions in the revised manuscript. (see Results section, line 180, page 9).

- line 190 please be consistent: either variable...was or variables....were

Response: We have made corrections according to your instructions in the revised manuscript. (see Results section, line 185, page 9).

- line 218 please eliminate the "s" of "models"
Response: We have made corrections according to your instructions in the revised manuscript. (see Results section, line 207, page 10).

- line 233 must read FibroScan has been, not have been

Response: We have made corrections according to your instructions in the revised manuscript. (see Discussion section, line 221, page 11).

- line 240 please use "concentrating on", not "concentrated in"

Response: We have made corrections according to your instructions in the revised manuscript. (see Discussion section, line 227, page 11).

- line 243 "been" and "already" must swap position

Response: We have made corrections according to your instructions in the revised manuscript. (see Discussion section, line 230, page 12).

- line 249 please add an "s" to difference

Response: We have made corrections according to your instructions in the revised manuscript. (see Discussion section, line 236, page 12).

- line 253 please eliminate the "s" of values

Response: We have made corrections according to your instructions in the revised manuscript. (see Discussion section, line 240, page 12).

- line 302 please use "different" instead of "otherwise"

Response: We have made corrections according to your instructions in the revised manuscript. (see Discussion section, line 283, page 14).