Thanks for the kind reviews provided. The editorial and reviewer changes are highlighted in yellow in the revised manuscript

Reviewer 1

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Hello and congratulations on your manuscript! I would like to point out the following things: 1. The title seems a bit too generic. I would have said: Artificial intelligence programs in cardiology. I think it is closer to the point of your manuscript. 2. I would have liked to see some more detail on the mentioned AI programs: about the type of neural networks used for training, the obtained results: what was the accuracy? what was the sensitivity and specificity? 3. Why don't you write in conclusion section some of the leads that your manuscript open? I liked a lot the idea of having these AI software to low-end machines. It would really help in prevention and early-detection of some diseases. 4. The References are good and pertinent. Next time I hope to see more articles about experimental AI programs (with comparative data mentioned at point 2.)

Answer to reviewer 1

We thank the reviewer 1 his/her comments about this editorial, we will try to address his/her comments in this section and few changes will be added in the manuscript as because the comments are beyond the scope of our editorial about a broad topic like artificial intelligence and cardiology

1. The title seems a bit too generic. I would have said: Artificial intelligence programs in cardiology. I think it is closer to the point of your manuscript.

We believe that our title has to be generic as it is an editorial for a topic issue and programs is only one part of the topic

2. I would have liked to see some more detail on the mentioned AI programs: about the type of neural networks used for training, the obtained results: what was the accuracy? what was the sensitivity and specificity?

As an introductory editorial we tried not to be very detailed, this type of neural networks are quite different depending on the topic and due to that also the sensitivity and specificity changes from study to study

3. Why don't you write in conclusion section some of the leads that your manuscript open? I liked a lot the idea of having these AI software to low-end machines. It would really help in prevention and early-detection of some diseases

I think it is a good idea to add this in the conclusion section as the next phrase "The potential future lies on having this AI software implemented to low-end machines, it would really help in prevention and early-detection of some cardiovascular diseases".

4. The References are good and pertinent. Next time I hope to see more articles about experimental AI programs (with comparative data mentioned at point 2.)

Thanks for the comment. As we said previously this comparative probably goes beyond the scope of this editorial

Reviewer 2

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Not clear introduction is presented in this manuscript Repetition of the main sentences Many errors are presented in this paper No related works are presented in the paper English of the paper and the organization must be revised.   No new Idea is presented in this manuscript   There is no contribution   A comparison between the achieved result and other recent works is necessary.   The quality of the paper and the presentation of the proposed approach must be improved.

Answer to reviewer 2

I want to thank you the reviewer for the effort of reviewing our editorial, We understand that his evaluation was focus on a research/review paper… but our intention was to make an editorial of the topic giving a broad view as contribution. We hope you understand the aim of this manuscript