

Reviewer #1:

1. The title is so broad and lacking in specifics.

Response: Title had been replaced by “Big data and Variceal Rebleeding Predicting in Cirrhosis patients” to emphasize my focus – rebleeding prediction in cirrhosis patients.

2. The authors should include figures and tables with the manuscript.

Response: Figures and table were included in the revised manuscript.

3. The authors should review the impact of big data and AI on a specific disease and explain how and why it is better than a conventional method of prediction.

Response: An example of predicting onset of pediatric oncology was added in the later part of “Applications of big data”.

4. The authors needed to use a specific disease as an example for comparison.

Response: Registry-based research in pediatric cancer was reviewed for comparison in the last part of “Applications of big data”.

5. The English grammar needed to be substantially polished.

Response: Language of the revised manuscript was polished by *MedE Medical Editing*, which was recommended by <https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/searchacademicassistant>

6. Many orders, including citation numbers 40 before 39 and 68 before 41, are incorrect.

Response: After adjustment, the numbers of the references are in accordance with the citation order in the text now.

7. The format of the citation is not correct. The reference format is not correct.

Response: Blanks between the last letter of each sentence in the text and the square bracket were deleted. PMID numbers and DOI names for each reference were added in the reference section. The format of references was adjusted according to the “Guidelines for Manuscript Preparation and Submission-Minireviews”.

Reviewer #2: Thanks for recommending me as a reviewer. This review focused on big data and disease predicting. This review study is generally well written.

Response: Thank you very much for your review and appreciation.