

3 SCIENTIFIC QUALITY

Please resolve all issues in the manuscript based on the peer review report and make a point-by-point response to each of the issues raised in the peer review report. Note, authors must resolve all issues in the manuscript that are raised in the peer-review report(s) and provide point-by-point responses to each of the issues raised in the peer-review report(s); these are listed below for your convenience:

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: Lakshmi Nagendra et al. provide a more comprehensive overview of the advances in the application of artificial intelligence (AI) in thyroid cancer diagnosis, with clear ideas and a well-structured article. There are several places where the authors are suggested to revise. First, the authors mention the features or advantages of AI for each subheading related to the content, but rarely mention the limitations of AI. It is suggested that the authors add the corresponding limitations of AI in the appropriate places. Secondly, the authors stated in the Core Tip that "thyroid cancer has a high mortality rate", which, seems to be inaccurate. Third, there are some spelling errors in the article, such as missing periods and spaces.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: Dear Authors, 1. A good mini-review on AI in Thyroid Carcinoma. The authors need to work on the flow of this manuscript. 2. The authors should mention about the future of AI based apps in Thyroid Ca and a para on how the sensitivity and specificity in diagnosis and prognosis can be improved. 3. Please mention what this review article adds to the existing literature. 4. What is the take of authors on use of supervised/semi-supervised or unsupervised AI apps in terms of better results? 5. How to deal with the inter - observer's factor for improvement in sensitivity and specificity? Thanks

Points for the Rebuttal Letter

Reviewer 1:

- The limitations of AI-based systems are added

- Error in mortality in the core tip changed
- Grammar corrected

Reviewer 2:

- Tried to improve the flow of the manuscript
- Future of the AI mentioned
- Measures to improve sensitivity/specificity/prognosis mentioned
- Provides up-to-date information about recent developments
- Extra points added regarding semi supervised learning and its advantageous
- Sentence added regarding how to avoid inter-observer bias