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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
In this manuscript, the authors present a review to introduce the current status and future perspectives of AI in liver ultrasound. This work is meaningful. I hope my comments can help to improve the quality of this manuscript. 1. Chapter number of Qualitative evaluation and Quantitative study is the same. 2. I suggest to given the whole structure of your review in the Section 1. It is better apply a figure or table to completely illustrate your structure. 3. In addition, in this manuscript, we also suggest to present some pictures to visually illustrate the existing methods. 4. To the best of my knowledge, there are several key disadvantages of AI. First, it is difficult to prepare the large-scale dataset with ground truth, especially for medical images. Second, the interpretability and generalization of deep learning is low. However, in your manuscript, you do not refer to these disadvantages. 5. In this manuscript, as the readers, we also want to know how to do the next work in this field. Thus, I suggest to discuss the future works in detail.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The work is well presented and the methods adopted to acquire the inputs are explained with quantitative and qualitative analysis. The tabular column with briefing is well supporting the context. No concerns to address.