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**Reviewer's report:**

This is a well-written paper. However, instead of using the terms gynoid and android (which are actually adjectives), the clarity and readability of the paper would improve if android/gynoid fat mass is used throughout, including the title, unless the terms android and gynoid alone were used for a specific purpose. The term 'gynoid fat' has been used in page 7 (line 36) once.

Disregard my comment on controls as this study does not require controls.

More details would be useful regarding the following:

1. liver attenuation index

2. methodology - it is stated as a retrospective observational study - does it mean that all investigations were obtained from hospital records? Were the findings on DEXA and CT obtained from previous records or were they new findings? What about the other measurements? The questionnaire, examination and some investigations appear to have been done anew. Please clarify the methodology

Please state the abbreviations at each table (e.g. e-GFR is not defined in table 2) - even if they have been described in body text

**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.

Unable to assess

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

Yes
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:

Acceptable
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