

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/pm-23-30>

Comment 1: To highlight this my main recommendation would be to expand the section of the 'Future' paragraph and to include additional discussion of the use of AI and systems biology to cluster phenotypes and develop possible biomarker, as this is the most innovative part of the review.

Reply 1: Edits have been made to expand this section.

Comment 2: The paragraph discussing the 'Present' could be condensed, as this largely reflects arguments and statements made in previous article "Necrotizing Enterocolitis: The Future" (Neu, 2020). In the alteration of the text in the 'Present' section, the author could address the structure of the argumentation within paragraphs. Throughout this section, conclusions are drawn in sentences prior to the argumentation which can be confusing as a reader. This also causes multiple factual statements to be unnecessarily repeated. An example of this is the paragraph on 'Food component sensitivity', which contains excessive discussion of FPIES and jumps from background information to conclusions relevant to the topic back into background. The structure and argumentation of these 'Entity' paragraphs need to be streamlined for the 'Present' section to be able to provide valuable information on the necessity for NEC phenotype delineation.

Reply 2: Several edits have been made to make this section more concise.

Comment 3: The table discussing the different NEC entities could be removed, as its purpose and the function of the different columns is unclear. In addition to this, both spontaneous intestinal perforation and transfusion-related NEC, which are discussed in the text of the 'Present' section, and a title and description of the table are missing.

Reply 3: The table has been removed.

Comment 4: The manuscript would also benefit from a thorough check of the grammar and layout. Throughout the manuscript, sentences occur that are missing words. The use of quotation marks around NEC should also be standardized, as should the use of line and paragraph breaks and the location of reference numbers.

Reply 4: An attempt has been made to correct these problems with grammar.

Comment 5: The manuscript requires major revision, but if 'Present' section is streamlined and the 'Future' section is extended to include additional information and discussion on the use of AI and systems biology on NEC delineation, it will be a valuable and innovative article.

Reply 5: The author hopes that the changes made in the revised version will accomplish this.

Concern about overlap

Reply: have made several changes and reworded segments that should ameliorate this.