PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *Artificial Intelligence in Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 85904

Title: Drug-induced liver injury and Covid-19: use of artificial intelligence and the updated RUCAM in clinical practice

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited 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: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2023-06-04

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-06-25 19:41

Reviewer performed review: 2023-06-29 05:36

Review time: 3 Days and 9 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
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	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Overall, this manuscript presents innovative ideas clearly and effectively. The structure is well-organized, and the writing is clear and concise. The author has done an excellent job of explaining a complex technical process in an easy-to-understand way. However, to improve the manuscript, the author should ensure that the references cited in the introduction and related work section are thoroughly addressed in the reference section. Additionally, the introduction should provide an extended version of the abstract, with elaboration on the key points and supportive ideas and references. Lastly, the conclusion section needs revision to provide a more insightful and comprehensive summary of the manuscript.   Deep Convolutional Neural Network Architecture to Detect COVID-19 from Chest X-Ray Images. https://doi.org/10.24996/ijs.2023.64.5.38   Artificial intelligence for COVID-19: A Short Article. https://doi.org/10.24203/ajpnms.v10i1.6961

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *Artificial Intelligence in Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 85904

Title: Drug-induced liver injury and Covid-19: use of artificial intelligence and the updated RUCAM in clinical practice

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05199192

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Deputy Director

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2023-06-04

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-07-15 16:13

Reviewer performed review: 2023-07-22 16:28

Review time: 7 Days

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] 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

1. This article focuses on the updated RUCAM for assessing hepatotoxicity causality in COVID-19, which has significant clinical implications. However, it is essential to differentiate whether liver damage is attributed to the novel coronavirus itself or to medication use.   2. This study is a retrospective study with a small number of cases, and there were significant differences in basic conditions such as patient age. Additionally, the clinical data of the included patients were incomplete, and it cannot be ruled out that other causes, such as hepatitis virus infection, could lead to abnormal liver function. Therefore, the conclusion proposed in this study is not sufficiently supported. 3. The paragraph 6 of the manuscript suggests utilizing lower cutoff points, such as ALT values one to three times the ULN, instead of five times the ULN. This recommendation takes into account the common practice of using medications off label. However, it remains debatable whether this basis is adequately rigorous or not.   4. Is the basis for the appeal sufficiently rigorous in the sixth paragraph of the manuscript, which suggests using lower cutoff points such as ALT one to three times the ULN instead of five times the ULN, considering that many medicines are used off-label?   5. The manuscript

mentions a new RUCAM score, but it does not provide specific details about the upgrades. Could you please enumerate the upgrades to enhance its reference value?

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] 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
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

No.