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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This was a minireview on artificial intelligence applied to organ allocation in the liver transplant setting. In the first section (i.e., Introduction) the Authors described the current state of the art on organ allocation around the world, introducing concepts as utility and urgency. In the second part, they briefly described some studies which applied artificial intelligence in the setting of organ allocation. On a general view, the paper is fluent, and the topic is of interest for the Journal. My comments. - There are some typos that should be carefully reviewed (e.g., morbimortality; usefulness instead of utility; receptor instead of recipient). - The first section describes principles as utility and urgency. I think that also the concept of transplant benefit should be added. - Hepatocellular carcinoma is one of the most important indications to liver transplantation, with an increasing trend over time. Patients with HCC usually undergo transplantation according to utility criterion (and not urgency). Notably, the topic of transplant benefit for HCC has been proposed. This point should be added and briefly discussed. - In the core tip, the Authors dealt with ethical aspects of liver allocation. In what way artificial intelligence can help these aspects? - The Authors described results of three papers which applied artificial intelligence in organ allocation. Nevertheless, there are other many (and recent) papers which investigated this point (i.e., PMID 34019601; 33428298; 32274856; 32073494). In my opinion this topic should be discussed more in depth, adding new references.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This is a review article on role of AI in LT allocation. Multiple issues need to be addressed: 1. Introduction part is too long and has irrelevant information. Would recommend to make it more precise and concise. In addition the AI part is also very general, can be summarized and added to the introduction part to give the reader an idea on principles of AI.  
2. Applications of Artificial Intelligence on Liver Allocation: it is very very brief, authors need to discuss all studies and criticize them in details with taking into consideration the clinical context, study design, sample size, model used, statistics done, limitations, implications ...  3. Would recommend adding a table to summarize the literature to make it easier for the reader to capture
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
I would like to suggest you to present more discussion of different machine learning methods including the decision tree, the random forest and the artificial neural network.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The Authors fairly answered my previous questions. No further comments.