PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: Artificial Intelligence in Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 68032

Title: The Role of Optical Coherence Tomography in Barrett's Esophagus

Reviewer's code: 04025443

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Senior Researcher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Russia

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2021-05-09

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-05-09 19:09

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-13 20:54

Review time: 4 Days and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] 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

Dear authors! I read with pleasure and interest the manuscript entitled "The Role of Optical Coherence Tomography in Barret's Esophagus" submitted to the Artificial Intelligence in Gastrointestinal Endoscopy. The manuscript is a narrative review on optical coherence tomography (OTC) technique, and its application in patients with Barrett's oesophagus. Although a number of papers has already been published, the subject of the manuscript is still actual, as advanced versions of OCT become available. The manuscript is written with plain language, well-structured and easy-to-read. I see no major flaws and would recommend minor revision in the context of written below. 1. "Barrett's esophagus" is more widespread in the literature then "Barret's Esophagus". I would suggest to be in line with the authors of other 10,506 papers (by PubMed) who used the first version of spelling. Still, there are other 127 manuscripts with the same version as your. Please, consider revision. 2. Association of the covered matter with characteristic scope of the journal (Artificial intelligence) is not described. Please, consider to add some information to make the manuscript in line with journal's scope. 3. It seems that the Cor tip section requires revision to emphasize main ideas, described further.