Changes on the paper "Artificial Intelligence for Modeling Uveal Melanoma" by B. Santos-Buitrago, G. Santos-García, and E. Hernández Galilea

Artificial Intelligence in Cancer.
Manuscript No.: 59750, Minireviews

Dear editors,

This submission is the revision of the first submission; thanks to the comments received, which we believe that have greatly improved the quality of the paper. Here we explain in detail the actions performed to address every comment. In this document the reviewer comments will be colored in blue to be distinguished from our answers.

Best Regards,
Beatriz, Gustavo, and Emiliano

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)
Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)
Conclusion: Major revision
Specific Comments to Authors: The paper is well written and reader friendly. However, my major concern is the figures. All figures should be drawn by the authors. Also a figure legend is essential as all the figures are not well described in the legend. A schematic diagram for the artificial intelligence approach is required Figure 4 is very primitive, please update it. References should be updated.

We have reviewed the comments of reviewer 1:

- We have carried out a general review of the manuscript as far as grammar is concerned.

- Regarding the graphics and photographs, we have made new figures, without including any image subject to copyright. We have taken care of the figure legends to be more descriptive of the content of each figure.

- With respect to the schematic diagram, we have kept this graph since our goal is to make it easier to understand how to model a cell in Pathway Logic. In this sense, we define a "dummy" cell.
  In any case, we have included comments in the text to emphasize that this proposed cell and its representation is especially simple.

- We have verified the references and included a few recent ones.

Editorial office's comments (science editor):

Authors must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions, which are listed below:

1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a review of the artificial intelligence for modeling uveal melanoma. The topic is within the scope of the AIC. (1) Classification: Grade C; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The paper is well written and reader friendly. However, my major concern is the figures. All figures should be drawn by the authors. Also a figure legend is essential as all the figures are not well described in the legend. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; and (3) Format: There are 6 figures. A total of 86 references are cited, including 19 references published in the last 3 years. There are 2 self-citations.

We have taken into consideration the observations of the first reviewer.

2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B. No language editing certificate was provided.

We have carried out a general review of the manuscript as far as grammar is concerned.

3 Academic norms and rules: No academic misconduct was found in the CrossCheck detection and Bing search. However, the similarity index by the CrossCheck is high, the authors should revise the manuscript according to the CrossCheck report.

We have conducted a thorough review to reduce self-referrals and consequently the similarity ratio.

4 Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. No financial support was obtained for the study. The topic has not previously been published in the AIC.

At the end of the manuscript, we have included the reference of the research project in which Dr. Santos-García is participating.

5 Issues raised: (1) The "Author Contributions" section is missing. Please provide the author contributions; (2) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor; (3) PMID and DOI numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout; and (4) the authors should revise the manuscript according to the CrossCheck report.

We have reviewed these issues:

- An author-contributions section has been included;

- New figures and photographs have been elaborated. These have been uploaded to the platform;

- The PMID and DOI numbers have been provided in the references;

- We revised the manuscript according to the CrossCheck report.

6 Re-Review: Required.

We have conducted the review of the manuscript according to the recommendations of the reviewers.

7 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

Moreover, we have uploaded to the platform the report of the bioethics committee and included some other details (information of the corresponding author, photos and orcidID of the authors, etc.)

The document is prepared with LaTeX and, in addition to the PDF file, we have included the source files (`AIC2020.tex` and `AIC2020_frozen.bbl`).