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Gender difference in the impact of gynoid and android on the progression of hepatic steatosis in type 2 diabetes patients

General comment

The paper discusses an important and a timely area of research.

Specific comments

Title

Although the title describes the study adequately, the wording needs to be modified. Instead of "gynoid and android" the authors may use "gynoid and android fat masses". Please use "patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus" instead of "type 2 diabetic patients". More importantly since the study was done using only Japanese patients the authors will have to indicate that in the title.

Abstract

Page 4, Line 26 and 29 - The authors may change "Gynoid (Kg) and android (kg)" to "Gynoid (kg) and android (kg) masses". Please make the necessary changes throughout the text for consistency.

Page 4, Line 29 and 32 - "One year changes in LAI, gynoid and android were evaluated by gender." Please rephrase the sentence.

Page 5, Line 6 - Conclusions- Please indicates that the results of the current study are valid only for a Japanese population.
Background
Page 6, Line 16 - Please change "diabetes" to "diabetes mellitus" throughout the article.
Page 6, Line 56 - Do the authors mean "regardless of the weight of the person"?
Page 7, Line 20 - Please delete the word "which".

Methods
Page 8, Line 34 and 36 - Please mention a reference in justifying why the authors chose these limits.
Page 8, Line 56 and 58 - "Finally, 294 patients were enrolled in this .....The authors may change the sentence as "The final sample included 294 patients ...."
Page 8, Line 58 and Page 9, Line 2 - "The median with ......"Please rephrase this sentence.
Page 9, Line 2 - It is not clear whether the authors have used the existing reports of these patients where the tests have been done during 2012 and 2016 or a fresh study was done using whole body DXA once the participants were recruited. Please clarify and include the clarification in the text.
Page 9, Line 22 -Please change "the following" as "as follows".
Page 9, Line 51 -Were the questionnaires pretested? If so where and on whom?
Page 9, Line 58 - HbA1c - Please use the proper subscript [HbA1c].

Results
Page 12, Line 2 - Please change "......associated with that in LAI in female but not in male patients with type 2 diabetes...." to "......associated with LAI in female but not in male patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus ...."

Discussion
Page 15, Line 39 - Please change "generalization" to "generalizability".

References
It would be good but not essential if the authors can cite more recent literature than given here. At a glance there were only about 5 references to articles published in or after 2015.

Finally, please edit the manuscript for punctuation, grammatical and typographical errors. Although there are relatively very few, they need to be tidied up.

I would like to congratulate the authors for some excellent piece of work done here and wish them all the very best.
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