PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 80380

Title: Convolutional neural network-based segmentation network applied to image recognition of angiodysplasias lesion under capsule endoscopy

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05327699

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MBBS, MNAMS, MS

Professional title: Additional Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-27 05:50

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-27 06:24

Review time: 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Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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, 1. You have mentioned that ResNet was used for image classification while using CE. So, how CNN & DL algorithm classification were made on the basis of annotation . How many experts did the annotation ?   2. Were the annotations , classifications and grading were confirmed by some other diagnostic modalities ? 3. What was the grader variance ? 4. Role in identifying other lesions of the small intestine . 5. It's future applications and improvement in segment identification.   6. How many images were ungradable / not classified and possible solutions ? Thanks

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 80380

Title: Convolutional neural network-based segmentation network applied to image recognition of angiodysplasias lesion under capsule endoscopy

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04164617

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Spain

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-25 17:14

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-30 17:20

Review time: 5 Days

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

The article "CNN-Based Segmentation Network Applied to Image Recognition of Angiodysplasias Lesion Under Capsule Endoscopy" is very interesting but I will make a few comments to improve its quality.   Material and method. The authors should justify why you select the Network type that you include in the study, as well as Python-3 Must explain the acronyms you use for the evaluation index: PPV, NPV, MIOU, PA, and what they define, sensitivity, specificity, accuracy, precision... Results: Table 2 should be explained in the results, not in the discussion section. Discussion: the results should be contrasted with previous articles, for example by Leenhardt et al, Articles related to other investigations of angiodysplasia and convolutional neural network have not been included in this section (Aoki, et al; Hosoe et al; Noya et al; Park et al, Tsuboi et al). Finally, highlight what this research contributes in relation to the previous ones. Conclusion: Adapt the conclusion to the results References. Are references 14 and 31 the same? Thank you very much

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 80380

Title: Convolutional neural network-based segmentation network applied to image recognition of angiodysplasias lesion under capsule endoscopy

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05327699

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MBBS, MNAMS, MS

Professional title: Additional Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-25

Reviewer chosen by: Han Zhang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-01 09:09

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-01 09:23

Review time: 1 Hour

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
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Author ,   1. Correct spelling mistakes - images written as imagine in Author contribution. 2. Mention full forms and short forms in brackets first and then mention their shortforms like IOU , M , G etc. 3. Manuscript is better after incorporating the changes. Thanks