

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 89649

Title: Automatic detection of small bowel lesions with different bleeding risks based on

deep learning models

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited 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: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-08

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-08 10:28

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-09 14:35

Review time: 1 Day and 4 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Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish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



Baishideng

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 E-mail: office@baishideng.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

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 [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [<mark>Y</mark>] 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

Despite being a novel piece of work, it presents certain challenges that may hinder the reader's ability to fully understand its main point. These challenges stem from both technical jargon and limitations in the English language. Below are some examples of these obstacles: My Comments and Suggestions to Authors: 1- In my view, the abstract is overly cumbersome and difficult to extract the main point. It would be helpful to include more detailed keywords to enhance clarity. 2- The contributions made in this manuscript may not be adequate for publication in this journal. Therefore, I strongly recommend that the authors clearly define and elaborate on their contributions. 3- The proposed method and experiments are not clearly illustrated. 4- The Results and Discussion section of the paper appears inadequate and requires more attention, with a need for better explanation and elaboration. 5- The paper needs to be carefully looked upon for grammatical mistakes. 6- Some sentences seem to be incomplete and less meaningful. Authors are suggested to carefully check for such sentences. Additional References: The following articles could be useful: • From Pixels to Diagnoses: Deep Learning's Impact on Medical Image Processing-A Survey. https://doi.org/10.31185/wjcms.178 • Deep



Convolutional Neural Network Architecture to Detect COVID-19 from Chest X-Ray Images. https://doi.org/10.24996/ijs.2023.64.5.38



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 89649

Title: Automatic detection of small bowel lesions with different bleeding risks based on

deep learning models

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited 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: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-08

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ru Fan

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-12-15 06:17

Reviewer performed review: 2023-12-15 07:43

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[Y] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous



statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have adequately revised this manuscript, as a result, the reviewer would like to recommend this manuscript publish as is.