## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** Artificial Intelligence in Cancer

**Manuscript NO:** 67741

**Title:** What and how does the artificial intelligence apply in solid tumor imaging?

**Reviewer's code:** 05758135

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-05-01

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-05-27 01:01

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-05-27 02:29

**Review time:** 1 Hour

| | |
|---|---|
| **Scientific quality** | [ ] Grade A: Excellent   [ ] Grade B: Very good   [ Y] Grade C: Good<br>[ ] Grade D: Fair   [ ] Grade E: Do not publish |
| **Language quality** | [ ] Grade A: Priority publishing   [ Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing<br>[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing   [ ] Grade D: Rejection |
| **Conclusion** | [ ] Accept (High priority)   [ Y] Accept (General priority)<br>[ ] Minor revision   [ ] Major revision   [ ] Rejection |
| **Re-review** | [ Y] Yes   [ ] No |
| **Peer-reviewer statements** | Peer-Review: [ Y] Anonymous   [ ] Onymous<br>Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes   [ Y] No |

**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.

# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** Artificial Intelligence in Cancer

**Manuscript NO:** 67741

**Title:** What and how does the artificial intelligence apply in solid tumor imaging?

**Reviewer's code:** 05523556

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Professor, Senior Researcher, Senior Scientist

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-05-01

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-05-28 08:46

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-05-28 09:05

**Review time:** 1 Hour

| Scientific quality | [ ] Grade A: Excellent    [ ] Grade B: Very good    [ ] Grade C: Good<br>[ Y ] Grade D: Fair    [ ] Grade E: Do not publish |
|---|---|
| **Language quality** | [ ] Grade A: Priority publishing    [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing<br>[ Y ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing    [ ] Grade D: Rejection |
| **Conclusion** | [ ] Accept (High priority)    [ ] Accept (General priority)<br>[ ] Minor revision    [ Y ] Major revision    [ ] Rejection |
| **Re-review** | [ ] Yes    [ Y ] No |
| **Peer-reviewer statements** | Peer-Review: [ Y ] Anonymous    [ ] Onymous<br>Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes    [ Y ] No |

## 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.

# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** Artificial Intelligence in Cancer

**Manuscript NO:** 67741

**Title:** What and how does the artificial intelligence apply in solid tumor imaging?

**Reviewer's code:** 05526270

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** BPharm, MS

**Professional title:** Pharmacist, Research Fellow

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-05-01

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-05-28 22:00

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-06-09 13:06

**Review time:** 11 Days and 15 Hours

| Scientific quality | [  ] Grade A: Excellent    [  ] Grade B: Very good    [  ] Grade C: Good  <br> [  ] Grade D: Fair    [ Y] Grade E: Do not publish |
|---|---|
| Language quality | [  ] Grade A: Priority publishing    [ Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing  <br> [  ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing    [  ] Grade D: Rejection |
| Conclusion | [  ] Accept (High priority)    [  ] Accept (General priority)  <br> [  ] Minor revision    [  ] Major revision    [ Y] Rejection |
| Re-review | [ Y] Yes    [  ] No |
| Peer-reviewer statements | Peer-Review: [ Y] Anonymous    [  ] Onymous  <br> Conflicts-of-Interest: [  ] Yes    [ Y] No |

**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.

# RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**Name of journal:** Artificial Intelligence in Cancer

**Manuscript NO:** 67741

**Title:** What and how does the artificial intelligence apply in solid tumor imaging?

**Reviewer's code:** 05526270

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** BPharm, MS

**Professional title:** Pharmacist, Research Fellow

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-05-01

**Reviewer chosen by:** Man Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-06-25 12:55

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-06-25 15:06

**Review time:** 2 Hours

| | |
|---|---|
| **Scientific quality** | [  ] Grade A: Excellent    [  ] Grade B: Very good    [  ] Grade C: Good<br>[  ] Grade D: Fair    [ Y] Grade E: Do not publish |
| **Language quality** | [  ] Grade A: Priority publishing    [ Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing<br>[  ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing    [  ] Grade D: Rejection |
| **Conclusion** | [  ] Accept (High priority)    [  ] Accept (General priority)<br>[  ] Minor revision    [  ] Major revision    [ Y] Rejection |
| **Peer-reviewer statements** | Peer-Review: [ Y] Anonymous    [  ] Onymous<br>Conflicts-of-Interest: [  ] Yes    [ Y] No |

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. No change in the manuscript really made by the authors in this revised version except

for some grammatical correction.    2. None of the points raised answered by any mean.   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.    Thanks a mil!