



OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY

Frontiers Editorial Office,
Frontiers Media SA, Switzerland

REVIEWED BY

Bikash Sadhukhan,
Techno International New Town, India
Maria Teofila Vicente Herrero,
University of Balearic Islands, Spain

*CORRESPONDENCE

Liaoyun Zhang
✉ zlysgzy@163.com

†These authors have contributed equally to
this work

RECEIVED 09 December 2025

ACCEPTED 27 January 2026

PUBLISHED 05 February 2026

CITATION

Zhang C, Niu B, Wang R and Zhang L (2026)
Correction: From traditional metabolic
markers to ensemble learning: comparative
application of machine learning models for
predicting NAFLD risk in adolescents.
Front. Endocrinol. 17:1763989.
doi: 10.3389/fendo.2026.1763989

COPYRIGHT

© 2026 Zhang, Niu, Wang and Zhang. This is
an open-access article distributed under the
terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution
License \(CC BY\)](#). The use, distribution or
reproduction in other forums is permitted,
provided the original author(s) and the
copyright owner(s) are credited and that the
original publication in this journal is cited, in
accordance with accepted academic
practice. No use, distribution or reproduction
is permitted which does not comply with
these terms.

Correction: From traditional metabolic markers to ensemble learning: comparative application of machine learning models for predicting NAFLD risk in adolescents

Chenming Zhang^{1†}, Bin Niu^{2,3†}, Rong Wang^{2,3†}
and Liaoyun Zhang^{2*}

¹Academy of Medical Sciences, Shanxi Medical University, Taiyuan, China, ²Department of Infectious
Diseases, The First Hospital of Shanxi Medical University, Taiyuan, China, ³Graduate School, Shanxi
Medical University, Taiyuan, China

KEYWORDS

machine learning, non-alcoholic fatty liver disease, adolescents, feature selection,
public health

A Correction on

**From traditional metabolic markers to ensemble learning: comparative
application of machine learning models for predicting NAFLD risk
in adolescents**

By Zhang C, Niu B, Wang R and Zhang L (2025). *Front. Endocrinol.* 16:1681686. doi: 10.3389/
fendo.2025.1681686

There was a mistake in **Tables 2–4** as published. **Tables 2–4** contained a formatting/
layout issue: in each table, an extra blank table appeared above the intended
populated table.

The corrected **Tables 2–4** appear below.

The original version of this article has been updated.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated

organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

TABLE 2 Performance comparison of nine machine learning models for NAFLD prediction in the testing set.

Model	AUC	ACC	SEN	PRE	F1 Score	Kappa
ANN	0.715	0.778	0.470	0.285	0.355	0.230
DT	0.671	0.673	0.602	0.221	0.324	0.165
ET	0.784	0.808	0.651	0.365	0.468	0.361
GB	0.762	0.716	0.699	0.270	0.389	0.249
KNN	0.740	0.648	0.747	0.233	0.355	0.196
LightGBM	0.739	0.759	0.627	0.297	0.403	0.276
RF	0.760	0.844	0.530	0.419	0.468	0.378
SVM	0.788	0.747	0.723	0.302	0.426	0.297
XGBOOST	0.768	0.723	0.699	0.276	0.396	0.258

Models include ANN (artificial neural network), DT (decision tree), ET (extra trees), GB (gradient boosting), KNN (k-nearest neighbors), LightGBM (Light Gradient Boosting Machine), RF (random forest), SVM (support vector machine), and XGBoost (eXtreme Gradient Boosting). Metrics: AUC, area under the curve; ACC, accuracy; SEN, sensitivity; PRE, precision.

TABLE 3 Performance comparison between the ET model and TYG-based indicators in the testing set.

Model	AUC	ACC	SEN	PRE	F1 Score	Kappa
TYG	0.675	0.653	0.633	0.206	0.311	0.153
TYG.BMI	0.748	0.720	0.722	0.266	0.389	0.255
TYG.WC	0.760	0.714	0.823	0.278	0.415	0.283
ET	0.784	0.773	0.687	0.324	0.440	0.320

ET, extra trees; TyG, triglyceride-glucose index; BMI, body mass index; WC, waist circumference. Metrics as in [Table 2](#).

TABLE 4 Performance comparison of the ET model and logistic regression models based on TYG and its derived indices in the testing set.

Model	AUC	ACC	SEN	PRE	F1 Score	Kappa
TYG	0.697	0.653	0.633	0.206	0.311	0.153
TYG+TYG.BMI	0.758	0.736	0.684	0.273	0.390	0.259
TYG+TYG.WC	0.767	0.791	0.658	0.327	0.437	0.326
TYG+TYG.BMI+TYG.WC	0.768	0.797	0.696	0.342	0.458	0.351
TYG.BMI+TYG.WC	0.767	0.786	0.734	0.333	0.458	0.348
ET	0.784	0.773	0.687	0.324	0.440	0.320

ET, extra trees; TyG, triglyceride-glucose index; BMI, body mass index; WC, waist circumference. Metrics as in [Table 2](#).