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Reviewer's report:

It is difficult to determine whether the analysis of this paper is the effect of the HuaXueHuaYu therapy for NAFLD or the effect of the whole Chinese herbal medicine for NAFLD. In addition, it is also necessary to suggest the criteria for judging what the author have judged the herbal medicine classified as a HuaXueHuaYu as a Chinese herbal medicine. As the herbs of included studies are diverse, table 2 should be added to show the composition of Chinese medicine.

in introduction
The author mentioned that "Blood stasis syndrome is one of the basic syndromes of NAFLD". For those unfamiliar with the TCM, it is necessary to present all types of syndromes in NAFLD, among other things, which it is necessary to provide a reference for why HuaXueHuaYu therapy is the most important treatment.

Conventional medicine is presented as a control group, but there are a wide variety of drugs in Table 1, and the introduction suggests that these drugs have a limited benefit depending on the drug. Due to the wide diversity of control units, I could not expect a consistent effect of control group, it is needed to add a limitation to that. It may also be necessary to specify whether or not to consider lifestyle intervention as a control group.

in Result
It is mentioned to as none of the studies reported allocation concealment, but the actual figure 2 shows different results. Modifications and presentation of judgment evidence are required. If you have also evaluated the selective reporting or incomplete outcome data domains, you should be provide a rationale for this in the text.

Although the effect rate is analyzed as the primary outcome, it is not known what the effect is defined in each study. Also, unless it is a validated tool, it can be a subjective outcome indicator, making it difficult to admit reliability and validity. If the results of each study were to indicate what the effect was, or if there was a possibility that the same criteria were not applied in each study, it would be necessary to set the type-B ultrasonic of liver as the primary outcome (except the effect rate). In general, the effect rate, which is assessed by a tool that is not objective, may result low heterogeneity due to the bias of the study.

In the NAFLD guidelines for 2018, "Pharmacological treatments aimed primarily at improving liver
disease are generally limited to those with biopsy-proven NASH and fibrosis." Therefore, NAFLD Diagnostic criteria and severity of participants in included studies should be provided.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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