Baishideng Publishing Group

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: office@baishideng.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *Artificial Intelligence in Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 115054

Title: Integrating artificial intelligence in the diagnostic pathway of duodenal gastrointestinal stromal tumors: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 08173865
Position: Peer Reviewer
Academic degree and professional title: MD
Reviewer's Country/Territory: China
Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2025-10-06

Reviewer chosen by: Hong-Xin Jiang

Reviewer accepted review: 2025-10-20 11:14

Reviewer performed review: 2025-10-21 11:23

Review time: 1 Day

Content to be reviewed	Does the manuscript's content fall within the scope of the journal? **Yes** Is there any Key Word that is not included in the manuscript title? **No** Do authors' affiliations correspond to the content of the manuscript? **Yes** Does the Abstract contain the contents of each part of the manuscript (IMRaD)? **Yes** Are the Key Words complete? **Yes**

	Is the content of the Introduction adequate? **Yes** Is the content of the Materials and Methods complete? **Not Applicable** Is the description of the experiments clear and complete? **Not Applicable** Are the experimental data presented in the manuscript's biostatistics content reliable? **Not Applicable** Are the experimental data of the Results true and reliable? **Not Applicable** Are the quality and resolution of the images up to standard? **Yes** Do the selection and design of the figures and tables follow the principles of necessity and clarity? **Not Applicable** Is there any duplication between various parts of the manuscript and between the main text and the content presented in the figures and tables? **No** Are the figures and tables numbered consecutively in the order in which they appear in the manuscript? **Not Applicable** Is the content of the Discussion reasonable? **Yes** Is the Conclusion reasonable? **Not Applicable** Are all references necessary and reasonable? **Yes** Do authors omit important references? **No** Are all references related to the topic of the manuscript? **Yes** Do authors only cite their own earlier publications? **No** Is the manuscript's text correct, concise, and clear? **Yes** Will the manuscript's content be of interest to readers?

	Yes Are additional experiments needed for the study? **No** Does the research scope comply with ethics? **Yes**
Scientific quality	Grade B (Very good)
Novelty of this manuscript	Grade B (Very Good)
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	Grade B (Very Good)
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	Grade B (Very Good)
Language quality	Grade B (Very good)
Does this manuscript describe a study of the existing knowledge system?	Yes
Does this manuscript report a revolutionary innovation?	No
Does this manuscript report an unconventional innovation?	No
Conclusion	Major revision
Re-review	Yes
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: Anonymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: No
Are your review comments generated by AI tools?	No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This case report describes a rare duodenal gastrointestinal stromal tumor (GIST) that was initially misdiagnosed as pancreatic cancer. The topic is clinically relevant and provides an instructive example for differential diagnosis of periampullary masses. The manuscript is well organized in terms of structure, and the clinical and pathological

findings are described clearly. However, several important issues need to be addressed to improve the clarity, coherence, and scientific rigor of the paper.

First, the link between the presented case and the discussion on artificial intelligence (AI) is not sufficiently substantiated. The authors mention the potential of AI in improving rare tumor diagnoses but do not provide any actual demonstration, data analysis, or illustrative example to support this claim. As a result, the AI-related content feels disconnected from the main case narrative. To enhance the paper's credibility, the authors should either (1) include a concrete instance of AI or radiomics application related to GIST imaging analysis, or (2) substantially narrow the AI discussion to a concise contextual remark rather than an extended theoretical section. Presenting a hypothetical framework—such as how AI might assist in distinguishing GIST from pancreatic lesions based on imaging parameters—would also strengthen the logical flow.

Second, the report notably lacks radiological images such as CT or MRI scans, which are essential to support the clinical and diagnostic descriptions. Without such figures, readers cannot fully understand the imaging features that led to the initial misdiagnosis. The inclusion of representative preoperative images, ideally annotated to highlight key diagnostic clues, would greatly enhance the educational and scientific value of this case report.

Furthermore, the discussion section remains too general and could benefit from deeper engagement with recent literature. The authors may expand on how AI-driven image analysis or decision-support systems have been applied in GIST or similar soft tissue tumors, as well as address the current limitations or ethical challenges of implementing AI in rare disease diagnosis.

In summary, while the case itself is interesting and clinically meaningful, the manuscript requires stronger evidence, the addition of radiological documentation, and a more

critical, well-supported discussion linking AI applications to the specific diagnostic challenges highlighted by this case.

Baishideng Publishing Group

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: office@baishideng.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *Artificial Intelligence in Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 115054

Title: Integrating artificial intelligence in the diagnostic pathway of duodenal gastrointestinal stromal tumors: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 08173865

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree and professional title: MD

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2025-10-06

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Qi Xuan

Reviewer accepted review: 2025-10-30 12:23

Reviewer performed review: 2025-10-30 12:40

Review time: 1 Hour

Content to be reviewed	Does the manuscript's content fall within the scope of the journal? **Yes** Is there any Key Word that is not included in the manuscript title? **No** Do authors' affiliations correspond to the content of the manuscript? **Yes** Does the Abstract contain the contents of each part of the manuscript (IMRaD)? **Yes** Are the Key Words complete? **Yes**

	Is the content of the Introduction adequate? **Yes** Is the content of the Materials and Methods complete? **Not Applicable** Is the description of the experiments clear and complete? **Not Applicable** Are the experimental data presented in the manuscript's biostatistics content reliable? **Not Applicable** Are the experimental data of the Results true and reliable? **Not Applicable** Are the quality and resolution of the images up to standard? **Yes** Do the selection and design of the figures and tables follow the principles of necessity and clarity? **Yes** Is there any duplication between various parts of the manuscript and between the main text and the content presented in the figures and tables? **No** Are the figures and tables numbered consecutively in the order in which they appear in the manuscript? **Yes** Is the content of the Discussion reasonable? **Yes** Is the Conclusion reasonable? **Yes** Are all references necessary and reasonable? **Yes** Do authors omit important references? **No** Are all references related to the topic of the manuscript? **Yes** Do authors only cite their own earlier publications? **No** Is the manuscript's text correct, concise, and clear? **Yes** Will the manuscript's content be of interest to readers? **Yes** Are additional experiments needed for the study? **No**

	Does the research scope comply with ethics? **Yes**
Scientific quality	Grade B (Very good)
Novelty of this manuscript	Grade B (Very Good)
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	Grade B (Very Good)
Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	Grade B (Very Good)
Language quality	Grade B (Very good)
Does this manuscript describe a study of the existing knowledge system?	Yes
Does this manuscript report a revolutionary innovation?	No
Does this manuscript report an unconventional innovation?	No
Conclusion	Accept
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: Anonymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: No
Are your review comments generated by AI tools?	No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Feedback largely addressed, recommend acceptance.