

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

**Manuscript NO:** 87913

**Title:** An artificial intelligence system for the detection of Barrett's esophagus

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 00183279

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** FRCS (Ed), MD, MS

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** India

**Author's Country/Territory:** Taiwan

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-09-03

**Reviewer chosen by:** Yu-Lu Chen

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-10-03 05:44

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-10-14 03:28

**Review time:** 10 Days and 21 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Despite advances in endoscopic imaging modalities, there are still notable detection failure rates of dysplasia and cancer in Barrett's esophagus. Artificial intelligence (AI) is an encouraging tool that may potentially be a useful addition to the endoscopist in detecting ultra fine dysplasia and cancer. The introduction of AI in BE assessment have shown excellent results and thus has an extensive future potential. Well written article with good tables. Authors should include the details of staging of early neoplasia in BE and discuss the finer differentiation between T1a and T1b.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

**Manuscript NO:** 87913

**Title:** An artificial intelligence system for the detection of Barrett's esophagus

**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:** Taiwan

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-09-03

**Reviewer chosen by:** Yu-Lu Chen

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-10-18 08:17

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-10-19 06:40

**Review time:** 22 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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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

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 Results and Discussion section of the paper appears inadequate and requires more attention, with a need for better explanation and elaboration. 4- The paper needs to be carefully looked upon for grammatical mistakes. 5- Some sentences seem to be incomplete and less meaningful. Authors are suggested to carefully check for such sentences. 6- The conclusions in this manuscript are primitive. Rewrite your conclusions. 7- The manuscript is hard to be understood and words should be improved.

Additional References: The following articles could be useful: • Has the Future



**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>

Started? The Current Growth of Artificial Intelligence, Machine Learning, and Deep Learning. <https://doi.org/10.52866/ijcsm.2022.01.01.013> • From Pixels to Diagnoses: Deep Learning's Impact on Medical Image Processing-A Survey. <https://doi.org/10.31185/wjcms.178>

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

**Manuscript NO:** 87913

**Title:** An artificial intelligence system for the detection of Barrett's esophagus

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 04696174

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Chief Physician

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** China

**Author's Country/Territory:** Taiwan

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-09-03

**Reviewer chosen by:** Yu-Lu Chen

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-10-18 10:57

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-10-29 09:19

**Review time:** 10 Days and 22 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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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

This paper presents an artificial intelligence system for the detection of Barrett's esophagus. The AI system was trained using endoscopic images of BE and tested with histological images, aiming to bridge the gap in detection rates between endoscopy and histology. The study is well designed and its findings are relevant to clinical practice. My only question is about the resampling technique used to augment the data from the minority class. What was the resampling technique and how would it influence the accuracy of the model?

## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

**Manuscript NO:** 87913

**Title:** An artificial intelligence system for the detection of Barrett's esophagus

**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:** Taiwan

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-09-03

**Reviewer chosen by:** Cong Lin

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-11-14 16:55

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-11-15 07:40

**Review time:** 14 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No





**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

In. the revised manuscript, the authors have addressed all my concerns, as a result, the reviewer would like to recommend this manuscript publish as is.