PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Hepatology*

Manuscript NO: 80269

Title: Detection of colorectal adenomas by using artificial intelligence models in patients with chronic hepatitis C

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: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-21

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-21 07:58

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-22 06:37

Review time: 22 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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) [ ] Minor revision [Y] 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

Please read my comments/suggestions given below for preparing the revised draft: My Comments and Suggestions to Authors: 1- The abstract is not convincing and is disorganized, it should be refined to precisely illustrate what authors have done in this paper within 200 words. The abstract must be a concise yet comprehensive reflection of what is in your paper. Remember that reader want to know: 1-what is the problem. 2- why the problem is relevant 3- wants an overview of your approach. 4-need to know the results.   2- This application topic has not received much attention in the literature. However, the study, literature review and presentation require substantial improvement in several respects.   3- Some variables weren't defined appropriately. 4- Result and Discussion section is inadequate. Need more attention and better explanation. 5- I suggest extending the conclusions section to focus on the results you get, the method you propose, and their significance.   6- References aren't formatted according to rules. 7- Please, explain all the variables used in any of the equations within the manuscript. Additional References: The following articles could be useful: The following articles could be useful: • A diagnostic testing for people with appendicitis using machine learning techniques. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11042-022-11939-8 • Implementation of Machine Learning Techniques for the Classification of Lung X-Ray Images Used to Detect COVID-19 in Humans. https://doi.org/10.24996/ijs.2021.62.6.35

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Hepatology*

Manuscript NO: 80269

Title: Detection of colorectal adenomas by using artificial intelligence models in patients with chronic hepatitis C

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06325500

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Academic Research

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-21

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-29 01:59

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-30 10:47

Review time: 1 Day and 8 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] 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) [ ] Minor revision [Y] 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 authors developed a tool based on machine learning to evaluate the incidence of colorectal adenomas and adenoma detection rates in hepatitis C patients. The idea of the article is good, but I am very disappointed with the structure, standardization and experimental design of the article. ——The authors should modify the article format according to the standards of journal articles. ——The highest accuracy of the author's model is 56%. Whether the parameters of the author's model have been optimized. The author's model has not been tested with independent data or cross verified, and the accuracy and stability of the model need further evaluation. There is no statistical comparison with the existing models. ——In addition, the authors said: The models can operate either in the presence or absence of the parameters (age, smoking history, significant alcohol consumption, aspirin intake, ethnicity, HCV status, gender, BMI, and colonoscopy findings). How about the accuracy and stability of the model in case of missing data. It should be verified. ——The introduction, methods and discussion of the article need to be improved. ——Line 191, there is an extra space after "help". ——Line 201, The "p" should be italicized. ——Line 251, there is an extra space before "HCV". ——Line 277, there is an extra space before "MLD". ——Line 303, "focussed", spelling mistakes. ——The references of the article are not standardized.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Hepatology*

Manuscript NO: 80269

Title: Detection of colorectal adenomas by using artificial intelligence models in patients with chronic hepatitis C

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: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-21

Reviewer chosen by: Jing-Jie Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-22 13:46

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-22 16:48

Review time: 3 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] 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

In. the revised manuscript, the authors have addressed all my concerns.   Overall, this work is in good. I suggest to accept this manuscript.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] 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

The authors have addressed all my concerns.