

Artificial intelligence for prediction of International Classification of Disease codes.Wallace K et al. al. (jakir_ms@yahoo.com)

Reviewer's information			
Date review assigned	27-May-23	Date review returned	20-Jun-23
Reviewer name	-	Affiliation	-
Email	-	ORCID	-
Do you have any conflict of interest with the author/s?	No	Do you wish to be disclosed to the author?	No

Reviewer's comments (21-Jun-23) [Please select "Yes" or "No"]		Author's response (22-Jun-23) [Please write a response if the reviewer's comment is "No". You must change the manuscript as per your response. Mention line numbers.]	
1. Is the title appropriate?	Yes		
2. Is the research question or study objective clearly defined in measurable terms?	Yes		
3. Is the abstract accurate, balanced and complete?	Yes		
4. Is the study design appropriate to answer the research question or achieve objective?	Yes		
5. Are the Methods described sufficiently to allow others to repeat it?	Yes		
6. Are the operational definitions and ascertainment of key variables given adequately?	NA		
7. Are the outcomes clearly defined?	No	Thanks for your point. Our outcome is ICD prediction. We will clarify it in the manuscript (Line-128-129).	
8. Are statistics used appropriately and described fully?	NA		
9. Do the Results address the research question or objective clearly?	NA		
10. Are the tables and figures clear and appropriate to address the objective or research question?	NA		
11. Does the Discussion cover the main points of the paper?	Yes		
12. Are the strengths and limitations addressed?	NA		
13. Are the conclusions justified by the results?	NA		
14. Are the references up-to-date, and appropriate?	Yes		
15. Is the standard of written English acceptable for publication?	Yes		
16. Descriptive comments to the authors (Divide it into MAJOR and MINOR points).		Respond and reflect it in your manuscript. If you refute, justify your argument using references. Mention line numbers.	
MAJOR points		Thank you for your point.	
1. Kindly rewrite the introduction section, specifically highlighting the importance of ICD and identifying the current gap that could have enhanced your work.		1. We edited the introduction part (Page 4, Line-88-102) as you advised. We added the figure again for your kind review. In addition, we upload the figure in JPEG format.	
2. Kindly attach one supplementary document showing your search strategy in PubMed, IEEE Xplore, Google Scholar, and Scopus		2. We adjusted Table 1 and the finding section. For our understanding, we tried to explore the articles that were Artificial intelligence-based	

MINOR points		ICD prediction. We also attached the search strategy.
3. I couldn't see Figure 1. Could you kindly add it?		3. Added.
4. I suggest revisiting your title, as it does not accurately reflect the aim of the research		4. Revised.
Reviewer's Recommendation	Major revision	

Editor's comments (21-Jun-23)		Author's response (22-Jun-23) Please respond to all comments from the editor and reviewer(s). Indicate the line number(s) of the manuscript where the changes are done.
The flowchart is a very important part of this manuscript. It needs clarity. The first box do not provide any information about sources and search terms used. The second box has an exclusion box. It is not clear why those were excluded. The same thing applies to the next exclusion box. Kindly revise the flowchart, adding the meaning of all three criteria at the footnote.		Thanks for your point. We edited the flowchart.
Table 1 could have the following column headings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Reference number b. First author & Year of publication c. Database d. Types of models e. Key findings 		Thanks for your point. We adjusted the table according to your suggestions.
Methods: Lines 96–103: Rewrite these in one paragraph in descriptive terms, not as numbered items.		Thanks for your point. We edited (Line112-118) it as you advised.
Abstract: Methods should provide search terms used. Avoid acronyms in the abstract.		Thanks for your point. We added.
Title: avoid the acronym		Thanks for your point. We edited the title.
Considering the volume of the texts and simplicity of the message, this manuscript better matches Brief Article's criteria. To do this, you must reduce the word count from 1820 to 1500.		Thanks for your point. We tried to reduce but after addressing the comments, the word count is a little increased.
Editor's Decision	Major revision	