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Feasibility study and reference values of FibroScan 502 with M probe in healthy preschool children (BPED-D-18-01024R1)

Summary

The authors evaluated normal range of LSM and CAP using FibroScan M probe in 436 healthy children with 5 years old.

Comments

1. The title was expressed as preschool children, and only five-year-olds were actually included, so it needs to be corrected throughout the manuscript.

2. I think it's also meaningful to review the causes of measurement failures in the healthy children. It would be nice to add an analysis/description on this part (whether because of moving or because of too narrow ribs, etc.).

3. Additional explanation of statistical analysis and specific results are required.

   (1) It seems to be distracting to mix the results of parametric and nonparametric tests. You need to check if there are any statistical advice on this part.

   (2) For correlation, I think Pearson is more appropriate.

   (3) The results of the piecewise linear regression requires confirmation that no numerical interpretation exists. This is an unfamiliar statistic, so further clarification is required.

   (4) Are there both univariate and multivariate results in Table 3? Table format is ambiguous and inconsistent. Please check.

4. It would be better to unify the results in one decimal place, consistent with existing studies.

5. line 165-166: LDL-C was also different between the two groups.
6. line 216-217: Reference 16 and 17 do not include the part of steatosis. Please check and delete it.

7. line 227: Daisuke et al -> Tokuhara et al

8. line 232: Engelmann G et al -> Engelmann et al

9. line 233: So, they concluded that... -> The "they" means Daisuke et al, not Engelmann et al, doesn't it? It is confusing. Please clarify it.

10. line 275-277: The cutoff values of 75th and 95th percentile need references.

11. line 302-303: This study does not support that TE is "rapid" or "reproducible".

12. Figure 2: Frequency -> Frequency, LS -> LSM (It also needs to be explained the abbreviation of LSM and CAP)

13. Figure 2 and 3: The quality of the images is reduced. Modification is required.

**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 recommend additional statistical review

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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