PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

Manuscript NO: 84503

Title: Endoscopic ultrasound artificial intelligence-assisted for prediction of gastrointestinal stromal tumors diagnosis: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Provenance and peer review: Invited 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: 2023-03-20

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-04-03 19:20

Reviewer performed review: 2023-04-05 18:16

Review time: 1 Day and 22 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent　[ ] Grade B: Very good　[Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair　[ ] Grade E: Do not publish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　[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 [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] 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) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

My Comments and Suggestions to Authors: 1- The manuscript structure is too short and must be elaborated in the technology they applied as well support more rigorous technical aspects. 2- In the Introduction part, the new features of the proposed method and the main advantages of the results over others should be clearly described. 3- An introduction should clearly highlight the motivation, problem statement, the objective of the paper, gap in the existing research and the novelty of the conducted research. 4- The contributions presented in this paper are not sufficient for possible publication in this journal. I highly suggest authors to clearly define the contributions. 5- The proposed method and experiments are not clearly illustrated. 6- There are no citations for many sentences in this manuscript. Why? Please check. 7- Result and Discussion section is inadequate. Need more attention and better explanation. 8- Many details are missing and others unclear. 9- The conclusions in this manuscript are primitive. Write your conclusions. Additional References: The following articles could be useful: • Artificial intelligence for COVID-19: A Short Article. https://doi.org/10.24203/ajpnms.v10i1.6961 • MobileNetV1-Based Deep Learning

Model for Accurate Brain Tumor Classification. https://doi.org/10.58496/MJCSC/2023/005

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

Manuscript NO: 84503

Title: Endoscopic ultrasound artificial intelligence-assisted for prediction of gastrointestinal stromal tumors diagnosis: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03905597

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: Brazil

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-20

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-04-09 11:19

Reviewer performed review: 2023-04-19 06:57

Review time: 9 Days and 19 Hours

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　[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) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] 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

This review article is well organized, but it contains many problems. Thus, it is not acceptable for publication in the present form. Frankly speaking, it is very difficult to compare and summarize many previous studies of different levels (diagnostic certitude changes according to many factors, including practicians' experience, used diagnostic instruments, ---).   Major points 1) In this study, SELs other than GIST and Leiomyoma are not well analyzed (lipoma, neurogenic tumor, ectopic pancreas, and others). Thus, the title "―subepithelial lesions" is not appropriate. 2) The items should include not only size, location, echogenicity, shape, and layer of origin, but also" internal structure" and "vascularity (Doppler, and/or contrast)".   Minor points 1) English: To be revised. 2) Results: Why 4 review articles were included by error? despite their exclusion criteria. 3) Experts: Please define "experts" (experience of more than ? years of EUS), because naked eye diagnostic ability depends on their experience. 4) References: Please abbreviate journal's name (ref 19) 5) Figure legends: Too simple. Please add more explanations.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

Manuscript NO: 84503

Title: Endoscopic ultrasound artificial intelligence-assisted for prediction of gastrointestinal stromal tumors diagnosis: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Provenance and peer review: Invited 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: 2023-03-20

Reviewer chosen by: Jing-Jie Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-06-16 14:49

Reviewer performed review: 2023-06-17 16:51

Review time: 1 Day and 2 Hours

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: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

All of my concerns have been addressed in the revised manuscript. In my opinion, the paper is of good quality and meets the requirements. I recommend accepting the paper in its current form.