

Dear the Editorial Office of *Artificial Intelligence in Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*:

Again, on behalf of all authors, we sincerely want to thank the editors and reviewers who've been reviewing our manuscript once more meticulously, and we do appreciate the revision suggestions that will help us better our manuscript. We discussed carefully about the suggestions from your office and reconsidered the structure, language expressions (especially grammar) and internal logic, especially the construction of Table 1, which is an important part of the results section. We made the following revisions accordingly (marked red). We also answered the valuable questions presented by your editorial office, which were enclosed in this letter. Finally, we want to thank you again for your valuable suggestions. We hope that the revised manuscript is now suitable for publication.

Yours sincerely.

Hongyu Jin, Bing Hu

Department of Liver Surgery, Liver Transplantation Center, West China Hospital,  
Sichuan University  
July 7<sup>th</sup>, 2020

## Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: This is a very nice structured review on possible application of artificial intelligence in gastroenterology. I would suggest minimal changes to the text: please, add commonly required sections (aim, conclusions). I recommend this manuscript for acceptance.

Response:

We want to thank the reviewer for his/her comment on our work. We have refined the details of this manuscript, including grammar problems and even punctuations. Meanwhile, we have added the "Aim" and "Conclusion part" to this work. We do want to provide a high-quality work to *Artificial Intelligence in Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*.

## Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: The article will review the application of artificial intelligence to gastrointestinal (GI) endoscopy. It is a topic of interest to the journal. The work is well written. It shows the main areas of using of AI in GI. However, I would like to do some suggestions in order to improve it.

Comment #a: The paper represents a review of state of art. In this sense, it should be indicating if it is a narrative or exhaustive review.

Response:

We extremely want to thank the reviewer for his suggestions to add the critical information. We do believe indicating the type of the review we wrote is of paramount importance. Therefore, we have added the related information.

**Comment #b:** It would be very interesting to use tables that summarize the results so that it can be compared.

Response:

We do agree with the review that a table would contribute to a clearer and more unambiguous comparison of the studies we have included into our review. Therefore, we added a table summarizing the results of studies, especially those not very clearly mentioned in the text. However, we believe the results of some breakthrough researches should be more detailedly discussed, so some of these studies were directly discussed in the text rather than displaying in the table.

**Comment #c:** A discussion section would be necessary to assess the results obtained.

Response:

We agree with the reviewer that adding a discussion part would make the format of the article more complete and the logic of the study more convincing. Therefore, we have added a discussion part.

**Comment #d:** The section "Future developing paths" I suggest to call it "Conclusions and future work". In this section, some conclusions and lines of future work should be proposed. You can use what is written in "Future developing paths".

Response:

We agree with the reviewer that such a name would help the generalize the theme of the paragraphs. Therefore, we changed the subtitle to “Conclusions and future work” and we added more information into these paragraphs.

## **Editorial Office’s Comments:**

**(1) Science Editor:** 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a review of the techniques to integrate the artificial intelligence systems with medical information in gastroenterology. The topic is within the scope of the AIMI. (1) Classification: Grade C; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The article will review the application of artificial intelligence to GI endoscopy. It is a topic of interest to the journal. It shows the main areas of using of AI in GI. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; and (3) Format: There are no tables and figures. A total of 56 references are cited, including 52 references published in the last 3 years. There are no self-citations. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B. No language editing certificate was provided. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and Copyright License Agreement. No academic misconduct was found in the CrossCheck detection and Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. No financial support was obtained for the study. The topic has not previously been published in the AIMI. 5 Issues raised: (1) The “Author Contributions” section is missing. Please provide the author contributions; and

(2) PMID and DOI numbers of some references are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout. 6 Re-Review: Required. 7 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

(2) *Editorial Office Director*: I have checked the comments written by the science editor. I suggested adding some figures and/or tables.

(3) *Company Editor-in-Chief*: I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the Artificial Intelligence in Gastrointestinal Endoscopy, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Before final acceptance, the author(s) must add a table/figure to the manuscript.

Response:

We do agree with the editors with their comments and did the following changes.

1. We added a table to summarize some of the important works.
2. We added the missing information of some references, especially the names of the authors, doi and PMID. However, some of the references were from conference columns, so it was hard to gather doi and PMID for these works.
3. We added a author contribution statement.