

REVIEW REPORT

Title: Artificial intelligence-assisted manuscript text and visuals: Supporting scientific communication while preserving scientific integrity

Authors: Tanvir C Turin

Reviewer A: A: M Atiqul Haque, **ORCID:** 0000-0002-7598-2550, **COI:** None, **AI disclosure:** None

- 1. Comment** The paper reads more like a perspective or narrative review than a methodology article. If it is retained as a review, briefly explain how the guidance documents and publisher policies were identified and selected.

Response: I thank the reviewer for this observation. We have added a brief statement clarifying that the editorial and publication-ethics guidance and publisher policies discussed were collated by the authors based on their familiarity with these materials as researchers active in this area (Lines 77-85).
- 2. Comment** Briefly discuss confidentiality, data privacy, copyright, plagiarism, bias, and the risks of uploading unpublished or patient-related materials to publicly accessible AI tools. Alternatively, narrow the title to reflect the manuscript's current scope.

Response: I thank the reviewer for this comment. We have opted to narrow the title to more accurately reflect the manuscript's scope, which focuses specifically on the use of AI in preparing manuscript text and visual materials for journal submission. The title has been revised to "AI-Assisted Manuscript Text and Visuals: Supporting Scientific Communication While Preserving Scientific Integrity," which aligns with the intended scope of this paper.
- 3. Comment** Replace broad statements such as "mandatory transparency for any AI involvement" with more qualified wording. Disclosure requirements and permissions concerning explanatory visuals, copy-editing, and research images vary among the ICMJE, journals, and publishers.

Response: Thank you for this excellent comment. In the light of your comment, we have modified the section (Lines 135-
- 4. Comment** Consolidate repeated statements about transparency, verification, and human accountability to make the manuscript more

Response: We greatly appreciate this insightful comment and thank the reviewer for raising it. We have edited the manuscript to remove the redundant components.
- 5. Comment** Use British English consistently. For example, use "grey zone" and capitalise "Western blot."

Response: Thank you for the suggestion and pointing out needed corrections. We have made those changes in the revised manuscript.