

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Estimating global prevalence of metabolic dysfunction-associated fatty liver disease in overweight or obese children and adolescents: systematic review and meta-analysis

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Doaa El Amrousy

Submitted on: 22 Aug 2021

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2021.1604371

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

the authors performed a meta-analysis and a systematic review about the global prevalence of metabolic dysfunction-associated fatty liver disease in overweight or obese children and adolescents. they included 156 studies in their analysis. they found that:

- the overall prevalence of MAFLD was 33.78% in general population of overweight or obese children and adolescents and 44.94% in obese children.
- Ultrasound was the most commonly used diagnostic technique.
- MAFLD prevalence was significantly higher in boys compared to girls.
- a higher prevalence rate was observed in developing compared to developed countries.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

strength:

- 1- large number of included studies.
- 2- important topic
- 3- well written

limitations:high heterogeneity underlying some of the source data.

Q 3 Please provide your detailed review report to the authors. The editors prefer to receive your review structured in major and minor comments. Please consider in your review the methods (statistical methods valid and correctly applied (e.g. sample size, choice of test), is the study replicable based on the method description?), results, data interpretation and references. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

the topic is important and very interesting. methodology is sound. the manuscript is well written.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

yes

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

yes

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

yes

Q 7 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

Q 8 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?)

yes

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 9 Originality



Q 10 Rigor



Q 11 Significance to the field



Q 12 Interest to a general audience



Q 13 Quality of the writing



Q 14 Overall scientific quality of the study



REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Accept.