Point-by-point response to the Reviewers’ comments

Reviewer 1

Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. Concerning the comments:

1. The abbreviation has been modified as suggested and abbreviation AI has been used consistently in the manuscript
2. The introduction part has been modified as suggested
3. The section of “Artificial Intelligence in Clinical Prediction of Upper Gastrointestinal Bleeding” has been modified as suggested
4. Other studies have been added and discussed in the section of “Artificial Intelligence in Clinical Prediction of Lower Intestinal Bleeding”
5. Comparison and analysis of the researches of Shung et al., Seo et al., Desmukh et al., and Levi et al., have been added in the section of “Artificial Intelligence in Management of Upper and Lower Gastrointestinal Bleeding”
6. Studies from Yen et al., Klang et al., Namikawa et al., Yoon et al., and Wu et al. discussed the diagnosis of gastric ulcers and hemorrhage stigmata, hence they are included in the management of GI bleeding, and not the clinical prediction of GI bleeding
7. More discussions regarding legal and ethical aspect in the “Future Challenges” section have been modified as suggested.

Reviewer 2

Thank you for reviewing our manuscript. Concerning the comments:

1. Yes
2. More explanation regarding machine learning methods has been added in the Introduction section
3. AI-assisted colon polyp detection has been removed from the Introduction section
4. The studies recommended by the reviewer have been added and discussed in the clinical prediction of UGIB section
5. The report of dengue fever and spinal injury has been removed from the clinical prediction of LGIB section
6. More discussion regarding the study from Loftus et al has been added as suggested
7. More studies have been added and discussed in the management of GI bleeding section