

We thank the reviewers for the comments. We have modified the manuscript according to their suggestions. The manuscript has also been checked and modified for language-related errors by a company with Native English language speaking experts. A formal certificate issued by them is also attached. A point by point answer to comments is given below:

Reviewer comments

Comment 1:

The title of this article is: Building and evaluating an AI algorithm: A practical guide for practicing oncologists. However, the article does not explicitly mention which AI algorithm was built and evaluated.

Response:

The purpose of our manuscript was to serve as an educational review for practicing oncologists and radiologists, we have not described the development or testing of any new algorithm. This has been clarified in the text in the 'Introduction' section.

Comment 2:

In the "What is AI: Basic Principles" section, the author provides an overview of AI, It is recommended that the algorithm be more prominent here

Response:

We have not described the development or validation of any new algorithm in our manuscript, since we only intended to provide an educational review.

Comment 3:

In the "Radiomics and Radiogenomics : Shift towards Personalised patient care" section: "Studies have shown that these may be successfully correlated to outcomes such as patient survival and genomic mutations [13]". I suggest listing more literature.

Response:

Thank you for the suggestion. Information from additional literature has been added to the text.

Comment 4:

In the "Common Applications of AI in Oncology" section: The author discusses the application of AI in Oncology "Classification, Detection, Segmentation and Quantification, Image generation, NLP...", but there is still a lack of evaluation of the advantages and disadvantages of various algorithms.

Response:

Thank you for the suggestion. This has been added to the text in the ‘Common applications of AI in oncology’ section.

Comment 5:

There is no conclusion section in the article.

Response:

Thank you for the suggestion. This has been added to the text.

Comment 6:

Inappropriate use of punctuation and multiple spaces in the article.

Response:

The grammatical and syntax errors have been corrected.

Comment 7:

The typography of the article leads to difficulties in reading.

Response:

We have corrected the typography to make it reader-friendly.

Comment 8:

Summary of tasks and classification of tasks (Figure 4) may be explained more in detail.

Response:

Thank you, this has been added in the text as well as the figure legend.

Comment 9:

Given that it is a review, it should be indicated what type of review has been carried out, sources used, search criteria as well as other data that characterize the bibliographic search carried out as well as the analysis work.

Response:

Since it is an educational review rather than a systematic review, we did not explicitly mention our search strategy. We tried to incorporate representative articles and latest work from each relevant application as enlisted in our text.

Comment 10:

The groups of articles detected should be more clearly outlined. A section should be devoted to each thematic group of articles found.

Response:

This was an educational review, therefore we summarized the available evidence based on current usage and applications.

Comment 11:

It would be necessary to add a discussion section explaining the progress and limitations of the review work carried out.

Response:

Thank you for the suggestion. The discussion section has been separated from the introduction and basic concepts section, which deals with the applications, future scope, advantages and disadvantages,

Comment 12:

It would be necessary to indicate a section of conclusions where the work carried out is synthesized as well as a set of lines of future work.

Response:

Thank you for the suggestion. A conclusion section has been added to the manuscript.

Science Editor Comments:

The manuscript outlines the basis of deep learning and describes how oncologists can start AI projects through AI. The overall manuscript is great, and the logic is very good, but the format of the manuscript needs to be modified. 1. The article still needs a great deal of language polishing. 2. I suggest adding a part to introduce the advantages and limitations of AI as a whole, which is very important for readers.

Thank you for your comments.

The format of the manuscript has been modified

The manuscript was sent to a company for language editing and a certificate from a native-english language speaking expert has been uploaded

Advantages and disadvantages of AI in general have been added