

Section	Line #	Priority	Issue	Proposal	Committee Discussion	Owner (opt.)	Resolution (w Rationale if rejected)
page 4. Section 1.1	i. Bias within 5% (absolute PDFF) as determined in highly controlled PDFF phantoms	Low	The paragraph after talks what is meant by absolute. Whilst I accept this is perhaps pedantry, but if there was a bias of -10% then technically that might be considered to be "within 5%".	Can you change the 5% here to +/-5%. As I say it is minor.	Valid point. We will make the edits.	Houchun HU	Throughout the Profile, we have tried to clarify the meaning of "absolute", as not to signify absolute value in classic mathematical meanings.
3.4	I don't have line numbers but the bit that says "i.e. water-fat swap"	Low	it should be "e.g." not "i.e.". There could be artefacts (ghosting for example) that is not a water-fat swap. A fat water swap is an example of a problem, it isn't the only problem.	e.g. no i.e.	Valid point. We will make the edits.	Houchun HU	requested edits made
1.2	1-11	Medium	phrases such as "significant", "mild", "reasonable" are not precise and not helpful to those who don't practice PDFF. These criteria should be objectively defined, if not here, elsewhere in the document.	Suggest - no visible motion artifact, visually homogeneous signal intensity within ROI (as it will be pixelated if indeterminate due to severe iron overload), ROI of any shape, but area larger than a circle of 1 cm diameter	Valid point. We will make the edits.	Houchun HU	requested edits made
1.3	Claim 2	Medium	This linearity and bias are not included in this profile since the bias of MR spectroscopy based PDFF itself is not well understood.	However, its linearity and bias results are not included in this claim, since the MR spectroscopy based PDFF itself may have measurement biases and variabilities. For this reason MR spectroscopy is less preferable as a reference standard compared to highly controlled PDFF phantoms.	Valid point. We will make the edits.	Houchun HU	We have made some light text edits regarding CLAIM 2.
1.3	page 9	Medium	If we are going to make a cutoff for unreliable PDFF based on R2*, I think we need to say it. Or should we allow users to report the values, with a disclaimer that the value is overestimated, underestimated, or just completely useless?		Valid point. We will make the edits.	Houchun HU	We will provide a suggested cut-off for R2*.
4.1	PDFF bias in phantoms	Low	Are we going to talk about temperature bias?		Valid point. We will make the edits.	Houchun HU	We mention temperature as a potential confounder. It is left as an Open Issue, as we don't require temperature correction, but it is something the end-user should be aware of.
A.1	NA	Medium	PDFF has only been validated on 1.5T and 3T. Should we limit PDFF?	Use of commercially available PDFF sequence at 1.5T or 3T satisfies the specifications.	Valid point. We will make the edits.	Houchun HU	We make this statement in the Profile. We also leave it open for high and low-field magnets as an Open Issue.
A.6.	A.6.1	Low	Should we say anything about CS and AI recon?	Probably just say not enough data currently.	Valid point. We will make the edits.	Houchun HU	We make this statement in the Profile. We leave it as an Open Issue for now.