PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: Artificial Intelligence in Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 66998

Title: Artificial intelligence in endoscopy of the oesophagus: challenges and future directions

Reviewer's code: 05759722

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Research Scientist, Teaching Assistant

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Malaysia

Author's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Manuscript submission date: 2021-05-22

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-05-30 12:07

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-07 10:43

Review time: 7 Days and 22 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Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors of this study have proposed a very interesting study for highlighted the challenges and future directions of AI in endoscopy of the oesophagus. This manuscript is well-written and discusses the applications of artificial intelligence systems to improve the early detection of oesophageal cancers, highlighting their benefits and drawbacks, and the challenges such systems face in endoscopy practice. 1. Introduction is not sufficient enough. Authors should highlight more on the background and motivation of the study. what are the importance of this minireview? 2. The second section has introduced the state-of-the-art deep of learning technique and its application to medical field. I suggest author to summarize this section in a form of table to ease the readability and enhance the presentation of the paper. 3. Figure 3 is missing. Please check. 4. In section 3.2.3 the authors explained the Figure and referred to it as Figure 3 while the figure its number as Figure 4. Please revise. 5. The authors have used very recent literature and up to date referencing. And the future work and conclusion section is very efficient. However, I suggest author to rename the last section as future work and conclusion. Or make a new section for conclusion to summarize the overall of the study findings. 6. Lastly, the paper still required a carefully proofreading since comas missing in many places. State of the art needs to be written as state-of-the-art.