Response to Reviewer`s comments

Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. The corrections recommended by the respected reviewers are addressed in different sections of the manuscript.

Dear Author, The topic is exciting and current.
Authors` response: Dear reviewer, thank you very much for your positive comment.

However, it would be expected to add a bibliography from 2023.
Authors` response: Thank you very much for your valuable feedback. We now have revised the manuscript and added 5 recent papers published in 2023.

It should be noted that AI and ML are disruptive technologies in the healthcare field and distinct from each other. The author will be able to distinguish and present the concepts.
**Authors` response:** We fully agree with the reviewer`s viewpoint, thus we added a paragraph and clearly highlighted the difference between AI and ML.

While the author generally presents the positive aspects, he points out a negative aspect: the need for consent in protecting and regulating shared data.
Authors` response: After careful evaluation and critical analysis of existing literature, we added appropriate information related to negative aspects of AI, including confidentiality, data safety and protection problems.

Still, he would like to see the threats of AI considered in the treatment plan for the healthcare professional and the patient.
Authors` response: Taking into consideration reviewer's valuable recommendation we revised the text and added possible threats of AI for healthcare professionals and patients.

Finally, authors want to thank the reviewer for valuable suggestions and recommendations which helped us to revise the manuscript and improve the text. We hope that revised version of the manuscript will be acceptable for the publication.

Response to Editor`s comments

   I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Clinical Cases, 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. When revising the manuscript, the author must supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript. To this end, authors are advised to apply a new tool, the RCA. RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. In it, upon obtaining search results from the keywords entered by the author, "Impact Index Per Article" under "Ranked by" should be selected to find the latest highlight articles, which can then be used to further improve an article under preparation/peer-review/revision. Please visit our RCA database for more information at: https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/.

   **Authors` response:** Dear Editor-in-Chief, thank you very much for providing us an opportunity to revise the manuscript according to reviewer`s valuable suggestions and comments. We can confirm that we revised the manuscript accordingly and provided point by point response. We added recent cutting-edge research results and improved the text.