

## Response to reviewers and editors

Dear reviewers and editors:

Thanks many for your support. After careful revise, here I make the response to your suggestion.

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade E (Do not publish)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Rejection

Specific Comments to Authors: The questions raise by you, are very interesting, though, and seems likely that with a detailed structure, the manuscript might be of great interest; especially to journal AIC. I suggest you submit a review version of your manuscript covering the shortcomings of published literature by detailing the key concerns, as much as possible.

Response: Thank you for your agreement. The original review article indeed has some shortcomings, which I have pointed out in the letter. I will revised the letter according to your suggestion.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade D (Fair)

Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: This is no more than an opinion. From my own view point, Artificial Intelligence will never substitute the human expert in any field, but AI programs analyze the available information without being "under pressure", etc. It is a must that human experts, specially in the case of medicine, look at AI programs as helping tools. Artificial Intelligence Systems won ' t replace the physicians. Artificial Intelligence Systems will take away from physicians the most routinely tasks and provide an "expert" second opinion.

Response: Yes, I think so too. Anytime the AI could not substitute the human expert, only could it relieve the workload. Language has been polished by experts.

Reviewer #3:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: This manuscript is comments on a previously published mini-review paper. The target mini-review paper have some problems. - The target paper is not a systematic review, even though it is a "mini" review. - The target paper has been organized by categorizing it by target area. This will gather attention of clinical readers. However, the description of the configuration of each system is limited, as in Table 1, which does not meet the expectations of engineering readers. - In the comparison between AI and conventional methods, the author focuses only on sensitivity and accuracy, and says little about the other advantages of AI. Therefore, I generally agree with the commenter's opinion. However, it should be noted that the target paper is a "mini" review, and it is difficult to make excessive demands. As a minor issue, there is a sentence in the manuscript that seems to be in the incorrect tense.

Response: I have revised it as careful as possible.

Reviewer #4

Here we make the response to the reviewer. 1. No change in the manuscript really made by the authors in this revised version except for some grammatical correction.

Response: In this round we have made the essential supplement according to your advice.

2. None of the points raised answered by any mean.

Response: We have pointed the obvious shortcomings of this review we considered it should be.

3. Again, you are very welcome to submit a detailed review article to AIC. Please find the attached document for the response on your submitted letter.

Response: Thanks again for giving us again the chance to revise it.