



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** Artificial Intelligence in Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

**Manuscript NO:** 63046

**Title:** 5G mobile communication applications for surgery - An overview of the latest literature

**Reviewer's code:** 03031527

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Spain

**Author's Country/Territory:** Germany

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-01-23

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-01-23 18:07

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-01-24 17:43

**Review time:** 23 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This is descriptive study focusing on the 5G in surgery. The issue is interesting since knowing the real impact of the 5G in surgery could improve surgical behavior in the real life. However, there are some major issues that should be clarified from the authors as, this is not a systematic review neither a meta analysis. This could be define better as a Letter to the editor an invitation to the expert. Some other issues: 1 In the last part of the introduction, there are some results data, such as the number of paper included, etc etc... 2 The title should better define the type of the paper. 3 Some tables might help to better understand the type of devices used. 4 Some comments about Ethical problems that might entail performing a surgery from another country.



### PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** Artificial Intelligence in Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

**Manuscript NO:** 63046

**Title:** 5G mobile communication applications for surgery - An overview of the latest literature

**Reviewer's code:** 05741744

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** China

**Author's Country/Territory:** Germany

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-01-23

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-01-24 01:36

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-01-26 01:56

**Review time:** 2 Days

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Based on my careful reading, the paper has some novelty, but its techniques and writing still need to be significantly enhanced. In what follows, I would like to give some of my comments for the authors' kind consideration. 1. The authors summarize the requirements for network in remote surgery, but do not illustrate how 5G can meet these requirements. In other words, please clarify the key 5G technologies that can meet the data rate and delay requirements. 2. I am still confused about what technical problems we may face when applying 5G into remote surgery and how to solve these problems. 3. In the comparison between 4G and 5G, only the benefits of 5G are listed in the article, but the problems faced by 5G are not listed. 4. The last sentence in Paragraph I, Section I is too complex to understand. It is suggested to adjust it to shorter sentences. 5. I wonder if there are any other applications of 5G in surgery except for the remote surgery. For example, you mentioned the IoT network, could you please provide more details? 6. The article mentioned that all researchers believe that 5G can play a great role in remote areas, it also mentioned that the construction of 5G requires a large amount of financial expenditure. Could you make a comparison with the resources spent in the construction of cable network? 7. It is stated in the literature that few studies have proved the effectiveness and feasibility of 5G in surgery. Could you please briefly analyze why this is the case? 8. In the remote surgery scenario, how many parts does the delay consist of? What is the value of the delay for each part? To reduce the delay of each part, please elaborate on the potential solutions. 9. To achieve low-latency and high-reliability transmission, as far as the current solutions are concerned, please discuss in details what are the shortcomings in this submission.