

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *Artificial Intelligence in Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 80702

Title: Artificial Intelligence in Gastroenterology: A Narrative Review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05789838

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-09

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-10 09:04

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-18 13:52

Review time: 8 Days and 4 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting paper but there are some issues that must be addressed before it can be published: 1. Too many Key Words, reduce to less than 6. 2. The paper's contribution needs to be stated clearly. 3. It may be helpful to identify the target audience for the paper, given the rather technical nature of research topic. 4. The conclusion section needs to include some recommendations for practitioners based on the findings, if appropriate. 5. A very important part of the current manuscript that is missing is an outlook for the future of the field. I think the paper is of very little value if it just lists the results of existing research. The authors should point out the future trends in the field based on the current status of the existing research and the research priorities that deserve the researchers' attention.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *Artificial Intelligence in Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 80702

Title: Artificial Intelligence in Gastroenterology: A Narrative Review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02904354

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Academic Editor, Associate Chief Physician, Associate Professor,
Deputy Director

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-09

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-10 00:19

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-18 14:49

Review time: 8 Days and 14 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Add the term "depth convolution neural network" as the full name of "DCNN". In the Esophagogastroduodenoscopy section, add the full name of the "AUC". In the Esophagogastroduodenoscopy section, the authors said "The CADe obtained excellent results in the two external validation groups (97.2%, 91.9%) regarding biopsy site". What does "97.2%, 91.9%" mean? In the Esophagogastroduodenoscopy section, add the full name of the "AUROC". In the Esophagogastroduodenoscopy section, the authors said "...Yasuda et al. used linked color imaging. (LCI) ...". This sentence should be revised as "...Yasuda et al. used linked color imaging (LCI) ...". In the Wireless Capsule Endoscopy section, the authors said "... and accuracy of 91.2%, 85." This sentence should be revised as "... and accuracy of 91.2%85". In the Wireless Capsule Endoscopy section, the authors used the word "non-bleeding" or "nonbleeding". Please keep them consistent in format. Why not explain the "BBPS" and "MES" in the Colonoscopy section? In the Colonoscopy section, add the full name of the "DNUC". In the Colonoscopy section, the authors said "With respect to histologic remission, DNUC had had a sensitivity of 92.4%...". This sentence should be revised as "With respect to histologic remission, DNUC had a sensitivity of 92.4%...". The word "EACH" should be revised as "EAC" in the Table 1. The content of the article is too long for readers to follow and understand.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *Artificial Intelligence in Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 80702

Title: Artificial Intelligence in Gastroenterology: A Narrative Review

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05789838

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-09

Reviewer chosen by: Ji-Hong Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-11-23 07:50

Reviewer performed review: 2022-11-23 07:54

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The author has made changes based on the comments and I have no further comments.