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STATISTICAL REVIEWER ASSESSMENT:

Is the study design appropriate for the research question (considering whether the analyzed population accurately reflects the design and whether you see any problems with control/comparison groups, e.g., likely confounders)?

Yes - overall design, population, and control groups are appropriate

Are methodologies adequate and well implemented (considering whether assumptions are addressed and whether analyses are robust)?

Yes - methodologies are adequate and well implemented, assumptions are addressed, analysis is robust

Are the analyses adequately communicated (considering whether reporting details are adequate and whether figures and tables are well labeled and described)?

No - there are minor issues

Does the interpretation accurately reflect the analyses without overstatement (considering whether limitations/bias are acknowledged and whether accurate descriptors, e.g., 'significant', are used)?

No - there are minor issues

Could an appropriately REVISED version of this work represent a statistically sound contribution? Probably - with minor revisions

STATISTICAL REVIEWER COMMENTS:

Overall, this is a well-written article with a clear focus and research objective. I have provided feedback for each section of the paper.

Abstract

Please include the number of men and women in the result section.
Introduction

There is a need in the opening paragraph to expand on the existing literature as it relates to (NAFLD) in the global context. There should be a discussion of the state of the research to this point in time and why this study is warranted.

Would the authors also include some context about the obesity rates in Iran.

Methods

There needs to be a discussion of the psychometric properties of the FFQ and a statement as to why this instrument was used. Are there other tools that could be considered?

A rationale for the statement on page 7, line 9-10 is needed with the appropriate citation. How was this cut-off determined?

Results

The methodology employed is appropriate and relevant to the research question. The authors should state the type of logistic regression they have employed in this section (e.g., SPSS uses block enter design, etc). The statistical analysis is well done and comprehensive. The tables are organized and easy to follow.

Discussion

The results of the paper need to be analyzed within the context of the existing literature. The discussion does not include this type of analysis. Furthermore, the limitation section should include that the data collected from the FFQ is self-reported.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

The authors should address my feedback to improve the quality of the manuscript. I am happy to review the revised paper.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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 am able to assess the statistics

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