PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *Artificial Intelligence in Medical Imaging*

Manuscript NO: 75310

Title: Advances and horizons for artificial intelligence of endoscopic screening and surveillance of gastric and esophageal disease

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03093768

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Chief Doctor, Doctor, Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-01-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-28 14:00

Reviewer performed review: 2022-02-08 01:33

Review time: 10 Days and 11 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [Y] Grade E: Do not publish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

Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The content of the paper involves the application of AI in endoscopic screening and detection of gastric and esophageal diseases. The content is very rich, but the full text lacks logic. Various AI algorithms and technologies are interspersed, and different endoscopic technologies appear randomly, making it difficult for readers to gain a clear understanding of the current status and progress of the field. If the various AI concepts are clearly introduced in the background, endoscopic technology. Then, the application of AI technology in endoscopic examination of benign and malignant diseases of the stomach and esophagus is described, and the differences between various technologies or AI algorithms are shown in a table, which may allow readers to obtain a better reading experience. The limitations of AI in endoscopic applications in different diseases are largely similar, and it seems unnecessary to describe them separately. In addition, some definitions need to be clearly stated in the text, such as "small polyps".

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *Artificial Intelligence in Medical Imaging*

Manuscript NO: 75310

Title: Advances and horizons for artificial intelligence of endoscopic screening and surveillance of gastric and esophageal disease

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05742869

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Research Scientist, Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Kazakhstan

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-01-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-02-09 03:17

Reviewer performed review: 2022-02-14 10:59

Review time: 5 Days and 7 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] 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) [ ] 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

1 Title. The title reflects the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript.   2 Abstract. The abstract summarizes and reflects the work described in the manuscript.   3 Key words. The key words reflect the focus of the manuscript.   4 Background.   The manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the Artificial intelligence   5 Methods. There is currently no search strategy. It would be nice if the search strategy was included in the methods.   6 Results. it is necessary to add a conclusion section and reflect the main points of application of artificial intelligence.   7 Discussion. There is not enough analysis in the review, mainly the facts of other authors are presented. It would be nice to include a discussion section.   8 Illustrations and tables.   Good quality block diagram, which reflects the principle of artificial intelligence 9 References.   The manuscript does not contain self-citation, incorrect references.   10 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. It is recommended to add a discussion section and include an analysis of the information received. The style, language and grammar are accurate and appropriate.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *Artificial Intelligence in Medical Imaging*

Manuscript NO: 75310

Title: Advances and horizons for artificial intelligence of endoscopic screening and surveillance of gastric and esophageal disease

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05742869

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Research Scientist, Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Kazakhstan

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-01-28

Reviewer chosen by: Ji-Hong Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-05-30 03:57

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-03 11:20

Review time: 4 Days and 7 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	[Y] Accept (High priority) [ ] 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

1 Title. The title reflects the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript.   2 Abstract. The abstract summarizes and reflects the work described in the manuscript.   3 Key words. The key words reflect the focus of the manuscript.   4 Background.   The manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the Artificial intelligence   5 Methods. corrected 6 Results. corrected 7 Discussion. corrected 8 Illustrations and tables.   Good quality block diagram, which reflects the principle of artificial intelligence   9 References.   The manuscript does not contain self-citation, incorrect references.   10 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. It is recommended to add a discussion section and include an analysis of the information received. The style, language and grammar are accurate and appropriate.