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Reviewer's report:

Abstract- Methods: no thing was described about the two groups.

Abstract- Results- 2nd sentence: "P=0.000<0.01" is inaccurate.

Methods- Patients: It belongs to results section. There is no explanation why 30 patients exclude from the study.

Methods- Grouping Methods:

From which source the findings 'Porta hepatis retraction' and 'vascular proliferation around the fibrous portal palate' obtained in a four years RETROSPECTIVE study without a clear description.

Is the assessment of liver stiffness is a routine procedure for these four years period?

To best of my understanding- the main idea of the manuscript is; in biliary atresia more liver cirrhosis causes more surgically difficult Kasai operation, the difficult operation can be defined by porta hepatis retraction' and 'vascular proliferation around the fibrous portal plate', LSM can noninvasively asses the degree of liver fibrosis and if LSM value is over a cut off value (23.75kPa), the patient should be transferred to a larger clinic.

There is no clear description of "porta hepatis retraction" and "vascular proliferation around the fibrous portal palate"

How it is concluded that 'porta hepatis retraction' and 'vascular proliferation around the fibrous portal plate' negatively affected the prognosis? The only consequence may be only aching back of the surgeon.
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.

Yes

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

No

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:
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