PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 78720

Title: Artificial intelligence-assisted psychosis risk screening in adolescents: Practices and challenges

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06090125

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Lecturer, Technical Editor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iraq

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-07-11

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-07-12 07:34

Reviewer performed review: 2022-07-12 09:23

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The work is somehow new but several limitations from the English to the technical hinder to grasp the main point of the work, some of them are listed below: My Comments and Suggestions to Authors: 1- In my opinion, the abstract is too cumbersome and is hard to catch the key point. The keywords need to be more detailed. 2- The introduction must be an extended version of the abstract. The authors must elaborate on the points highlighted on the abstract and give supportive ideas and references. 3- An introduction should clearly highlight the motivation, problem statement, the objective of the paper, gap in the existing research and the novelty of the conducted research. 4- The contributions presented in this paper are not sufficient for possible publication in this journal. I highly suggest authors to clearly define the contributions. 5- The literature has to be strongly updated with some relevant and recent papers focused on the fields dealt with the manuscript. 6- The writing of the manuscript. There are a many incomplete sentences or sentences without subjects. 7- Many details are missing and others unclear. 8- The conclusions in this manuscript are primitive. Write your conclusions. 9- The manuscript is hard to be understood and words should be improved. Additional References: The following articles could be useful: - A diagnostic testing for people with appendicitis using machine learning techniques. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11042-022-11939-8 - Has the Future Started? The Current Growth of Artificial Intelligence, Machine Learning, and Deep Learning. https://doi.org/10.52866/ijcsm.2022.01.01.013

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous　[　] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [　] Yes　[Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Fluent and well organized manuscript, easy to read. Interesting and recent topic. The references are appropriate and recent. Although I am not a specialist on the subject, in my opinion it can be accepted for publication

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[Y] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In. the revised manuscript, the authors have addressed all my concerns.   Therefore, the manuscript should be accepted for publication.