# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 56970

**Title:** Diagnostic advances of artificial intelligence and radiomics in gastroenterology

**Reviewer's code:** 05128663

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** BSc, MD, MSc, PhD

**Professional title:** Academic Research, Attending Doctor, Postdoc, Research Associate, Research Fellow

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-05-27

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jia-Ping Yan

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-06-20 14:29

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-06-26 07:37

**Review time:** 5 Days and 17 Hours

| 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[  ] Grade D: Fair    [  ] Grade E: Do not publish |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    [  ] 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 | [ Y] Yes    [  ] No |
| Peer-reviewer statements | Peer-Review: [ Y] Anonymous    [  ] Onymous<br>Conflicts-of-Interest: [  ] Yes    [ Y] No |

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article with the title "Role of Monoclonal Antibody drugs in the treatment of COVID-19" is in generally well done, but I would offer these comments to the investigators:    1) Some spelling mistakes throughout manuscript. Please revise. 2) The manuscript flow needs improvement. Each section appears to be completely separate from the rest of the manuscript. 2) Please revise the sentence "For this reason drugs blockers inflammatory reaction such as IL-1 blockers.." 3) It strongly proposes a figure with the jack/stat signaling pathway and its effect on cytokines' regulation. 4) Please provide more agents against IL-1, IL-6 and jack/stat. Moreover a second table with clinical trials (numbers, specification etc) in other inflammatory diseases beside SARS-CoV-2 will be useful.    Criteria Checklist 1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Answer: YES  2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Answer: YES  3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Answer: YES   4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Answer: Generally YES   5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Answer: -  6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? Answer: -  7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? Answer: -  8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and

appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? Answer: I recommend some to prepare a Table and a figure 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? Answer: - 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Answer: -  11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? Answer: generally YES. More references from the 2019-2020 period.   12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? Answer: The manuscript attempts to present an interesting perspective for diagnostic advances of artificial intelligence and radiomics in gastroenterology  13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting?   14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics?

# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 56970

**Title:** Diagnostic advances of artificial intelligence and radiomics in gastroenterology

**Reviewer's code:** 03805726

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-05-27

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jia-Ping Yan

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-06-23 21:07

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-06-30 13:48

**Review time:** 6 Days and 16 Hours

| 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   [ 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   [ 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 review discusses great potentials for the application of AI and radiomics on gastroenterology.     In my opinion, a good review should not just focus on summarizing positive aspects of AI available in the literatures. It should also discuss its limitations as well. Could the authors discuss what are the major barriers to bring AI and radiomics to routine clinical practice and how to overcome these barriers? Could the authors discuss studies comparing the performance of AI to radiologists in diagnosis of difficult entities? Could the author provide a model that how AI could be incorporated into current clinical radiology workflow to help radiologists to improve accuracy of diagnosis?

# RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

| 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 statements | Peer-Review: [ Y] Anonymous  [  ] Onymous <br> Conflicts-of-Interest: [  ] Yes  [ Y] No |

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The response of the authors are completely acceptable.