

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 84243

Title: Research trends on artificial intelligence and endoscopy in digestive diseases: A

bibliometric analysis from 1990 to 2022

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 01221925

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: AGAF, FACS, FICS, MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Greece

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-04

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-03-04 09:42

Reviewer performed review: 2023-03-04 13:14

Review time: 3 Hours

	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair
this manuscript	[] Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance
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

This is an interesting paper evaluating the role of AI in endoscopy in digestive diseases through a bibliometric analysis. The authors present a thorough summary of the areas where there appears to be significant potential for the application of AI in digestive diseases. The authors may wish to consider adding in the discussion a paragraph about the limitations of the use of AI, having to do with ethical, legal and data-related issues.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript NO: 84243

Title: Research trends on artificial intelligence and endoscopy in digestive diseases: A

bibliometric analysis from 1990 to 2022

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06388528

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-04

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-03-18 03:38

Reviewer performed review: 2023-03-26 09:48

Review time: 8 Days and 6 Hours

	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C:
Scientific quality	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



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 [Y] 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

Through bibliometric analysis, the manuscript comprehensively evaluated the application of artificial intelligence-assisted endoscopy in the detection of different digestive diseases. It shows that "cancer" and "polyp" are the hot spots in this field. It is concluded that artificial intelligence can improve the disease detection rate and the endoscopic image diagnosis program is effective. 1. Title. The title accurately reflects the main theme of the article. 2. Abstract. The method of literature extraction is not explained briefly in the abstract, so it is suggested to supplement. 3.Key Words. The key words reflect the emphasis of the article. 4.Background. The background introduction and significance description of artificial intelligence are relatively lacking, and there is a lack of reference support. It is suggested to increase the introduction of artificial intelligence and cite more references. 5. Methods. The manuscript describes in detail the search strategy, research selection, data extraction and analysis, but does not describe the conflict problems solved by the third author, so it is suggested to supplement. 6.Results. The purpose of the study was achieved by analyzing title, author, institution, country, endoscopic type, disease type, AI performance, publications,



citations, journals, and H-index. Through data analysis, it provides a reference for the foreground of artificial intelligence and endoscopic images for researchers. 7.Discussion. The manuscript is the first bibliometric analysis to comprehensively illustrate the application of AI-assisted digestive endoscopy in digestive system diseases. Through the discussion of the development trend of this field, the previous research in this field, the basic analysis of bibliometric indicators and so on highlighted the key points. The results are concise, clear, accurate and logical. 8.Illustrations and tables. (1)The overall picture (2) Figure 2D: Too is too small and the resolution is low, which affects the observation. few vertical scale, suggested to add. (3) The chart data is sufficient, and a variety of colors are used to represent more accurately. 9. Biostatistics. The manuscript meets the requirements of biostatistics. 10.Units. The manuscript meets the requirements of using SI units. 11. References. The manuscript cites the literature properly, and some articles have been published for a long time without self-reference. 12.Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. The manuscript chart is reliable, clear, accurate and logical, and some language and grammar need to be improved.