We are grateful to the editors and reviewers for the review and constructive feedback. The following have been reflected on the manuscript.

Reviewer #1

1 Title. The title reflects the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript.
Answer: Thank you for your thoughtful review.

2 Abstract. The abstract summarizes and reflects the work described in the manuscript.
Answer: Thank you for your thoughtful review.

3 Key words. The key words reflect the focus of the manuscript.
Answer: Thank you for your thoughtful review.

4 Background. The manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the Artificial intelligence.
Answer: Thank you for your thoughtful review.

5 Methods. There is currently no search strategy. It would be nice if the search strategy was included in the methods.
Answer: Thank you for your thoughtful review. We added the methods section that delineates the search strategy and keywords that were used to find the relevant articles.

6 Results. it is necessary to add a conclusion section and reflect the main points of application of artificial intelligence.
Answer: Thank you for your thoughtful review. We added a conclusion section and highlights the main points of AI's application and its future directions.

7 Discussion. There is not enough analysis in the review, mainly the facts of other authors are presented. It would be nice to include a discussion section.
Answer: Thank you for your thoughtful review. We added a discussion that ties the proposed evidence on the sections reviewed as well as analyzes and introduces limitations of the current systems and future directions.

8 Illustrations and tables. Good quality block diagram, which reflects the principle of artificial intelligence
Answer: Thank you for your thoughtful review.

9 References. The manuscript does not contain self-citation, incorrect references.
Answer: Thank you for your thoughtful review.

10 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. It is recommended to add a discussion section and include an analysis of the information received. The style, language and grammar are accurate and appropriate.
Answer: Thank you for your thoughtful review.

Reviewer #2

The content of the paper involves the application of AI in endoscopic screening and detection of gastric and esophageal diseases. The content is very rich, but the full text lacks logic. Various AI algorithms and technologies are interspersed, and different endoscopic technologies appear randomly, making it difficult for readers to gain a clear understanding of the current status and progress of the field. If the various AI concepts are clearly introduced in the background, endoscopic technology. Then, the application of AI technology in endoscopic examination of benign and malignant diseases of the stomach and esophagus is described, and the differences between various technologies or AI algorithms are shown in a table, which may allow readers to obtain a better reading experience. The limitations of AI in endoscopic applications in different diseases are largely similar, and it seems unnecessary to describe them separately. In addition, some definitions need to be clearly stated in the text, such as "small polyps".

Answer: Thank you for your thoughtful review. We arranged the sections in gastric and esophageal sections to subdivide the AI technology utilized in specific esophageal and gastric diseases. We also added the conclusion section to highlight the major limitations of the current AI systems used.