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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor:

Our manuscript has been extensively revised in accordance with the enclosed reviewers’ comments. All changes in manuscripts emphasized by red characters.

Reviewer #1: This is a quite interesting study, which examines associations between calf circumference, NAFLD, and insulin resistance. Calf circumference is presented as an index for the presence of these conditions.
Minor Comments:

1. In page 6, lines 39-42, the authors say that they used the 2005 ATPIII criteria for the metabolic syndrome. Instead, they should have used the 2009 consensus criteria (Circulation. 2009 Oct 20;120(16):1640-5).

Answers:

It’s a very constructive suggestion! According to reviewer’s instruction, we have re-analyzed prevalence of metabolic syndrome by the 2009 consensus criteria (Circulation. 2009 Oct 20;120(16):1640-5).

2. In the Laboratory methods, LDL-C was purportedly measured with an autoanalyzer. Since the Friedewald formula is usually used for its calculation, the authors should mention if this was indeed the case.

Answers:

We are sincerely appreciative of reviewer’s insightful comment. In our hospital, the serum LDL-C levels were direct measured by colorimetry method with an autoanalyzer, but not calculated by Friedewald formula.

3. Page 10, lines 25-31: Reference #30 cannot be considered "recent" (it is dated from 1999). Furthermore, reference #35 does not appear anywhere in the text.

Answers:

We thanks for reviewer’s reminder. According to reviewer’s instruction, we have changed “recent” as “previous” in the manuscript. Furthermore, we have added the reference #35 in the text.

4. Although the English is generally quite good, some editing is needed. Examples: page 4, lines 36-42, page 9, line 6 ("Excluding those with diagnosed diabetes yield similar results"), page 10, line 12 ("association may partly due to difference"), page 10, lines 50-56.

Answers:

We are sincerely appreciative of reviewer’s thought-provoking comments. According to reviewer’s instruction, we have revised the expression in the text.
Reviewer #2: I think that this was a very interesting point to investigate using the extensive data that was available and I commend the authors on doing this. Would it be possible to present the results in a graphical format, for example- before and after the adjustment of factors such as BMI? I feel that this may be easier for readers to see and interpret visually. Minor language corrections are needed.

Answers:

We are sincerely appreciative of reviewer’s constructive and thought-provoking comments. As reviewer’s description, the data presented in table 3 may be not easier for readers to see. However, given the data presented in table 3 come from multiple linear regression model analysis, we regret being unable to present the results in a graphical format. Anyway, we still appreciate reviewer’s reminder. Furthermore, according to reviewer’s suggestion, we have revised language error in the manuscript.