Response to reviewers

Thank you, reviewers and editors for their valuable suggestions to improve our manuscript.

We have added though according to the suggestions now.

At many places reviewer did not ask any changes, so we mentioned "Thank you" and at places it was nor applicable, so we mentioned N/A.

Reviewer 1 comment:

The content of this manuscript is valuable but currently it feels incomplete and perhaps over-reaching. Stating that these "are" current used of AI and ML and then not having examples of each use that is noted in the model/figure is inaccurate. Elaborate more and state which applications are currently used and give more expansive examples. and those applications that do not have any current examples should be noted as proposed.

1. Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? YES

Authors' response: Thank you.

2. Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? NO, the abstract gives the impression that the manuscript will be demonstrating or providing examples of the actual application of AI and ML in rehabilitation. The manuscript simply gives a listing of potential application of AI and ML in rehab.

Authors' response: Relevant changes done.

3. Key Words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? YES

Authors' response: Thank you.

4. Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? NO, a more thoroughly developed background of the current research in AI and ML that was cited would greatly enhance the manuscript. Instead the definitions of AI, ML , and DL are provided with 2 citations of possible application. The Main paragraph ends with Here's a perspective on how AI and ML are utilized in motor recovery in rehabilitation settings (Figure 1): -- Then each of the 8 applications are noted in a listing for the total content of the manuscript. However only 3 of the 8 have citations warranting the use of the word "are" used. It appears that 5 of the 8 are proposed uses. The 3 cited references should be more elaborated upon did give a more complete picture to the reader how this tools are being used.

Authors' response: We have added though according to the suggestions now. We have added few examples with elaborations. We preferred to keep the figure same as adding extra notes would give the figure more complicated, though we added relevant information to the text.

5. Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? N/A

Authors' response: Not applicable (N/A)

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? N/A

Authors' response: Not applicable (N/A)

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? N/A

Authors' response: Not applicable (N/A)

8. Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams, and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative, with labeling of figures using arrows, asterisks, etc, and are the legends adequate and accurately reflective of the images/illustrations shown? Nice figure

Authors' response: Thank you.

9. Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? N/A

Authors' response: Not applicable (N/A)

10. Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? N/A

Authors' response: Not applicable (N/A)

11. References. Does the manuscript appropriately cite 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? Good references though few

Authors' response: Thank you.

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? Yes

Authors' response: Thank you.

13. Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to BPG's standards for manuscript type and the appropriate topically-relevant category, 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. For (6) Letters to the Editor, the author(s) should have prepared the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting. Letters to the Editor will be critically evaluated and only letters with new important original or complementary information should be considered for publication. A Letter to the Editor that only recapitulates information published in the article(s) and states that more studies are needed is not acceptable?

Authors' response: Considering it as a Letter-to-the-Editor article we kept the article short and highlighted to-the-point matter relevant to AI, ML in the context of rehabilitation medicine. This is a high-yield topic currently in medicine, so we selected to write a Letter-to-the-Editor article on this. Relevant new proposal and changes have been also added.

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? N/A

Authors' response: Not applicable (N/A)