



April 30, 2022

Dear editor
Editor-in-Chief

Hope this finds you well

Re: Revised Manuscript Submission (Manuscript No: 75215)

We would like to thank you and all reviewers for your time and insightful and qualified comments after reviewing our manuscript titled “**Mapping the Global Research Landscape on Nutrition and the Gut Microbiota: Visualization and Bibliometric Analysis**”.

We wish to thank the editor and reviewers again for their time in commenting on the draft manuscript, which we believe has strengthened the paper. We carefully addressed all comments of the reviewers. A point-by--by-point reply to the comments is given below. We hope that we appropriately address all comments.

We look forward to you and reviewers’ comments on the manuscript and hope that the manuscript is given favorable consideration for publication in World Journal of Gastroenterology.

Yours sincerely
Sa’ed H Zyoud

Reviewer reports:

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: In this manuscript, the authors want to overview the research publications about the nutrition and gut microbiota, ongoing study stage in this filed. The topic is fine.



Response: I would like to thank you for the thorough reading of the manuscript and the professional comments and constructive recommendations, which help improve this manuscript's quality.

However, the methods should be expanded at least three databases should be used in the manuscript, such as Web of Science and Google Scholar.

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We explained why we relied on only Scopus as you suggested. We added this information to methods “In bibliometric research, only one database is employed because bibliometric indicators and literature mapping are difficult to execute on documents acquired from several databases. Furthermore, grey literature cannot be included in the data retrieved^[46, 47]. The current analysis was conducted using the SciVerse Scopus database for numerous reasons. First, compared to other databases like PubMed or Web of Science, Scopus has a much larger number and diversity of indexed publications. Scopus has nearly the same amount of journals indexed as PubMed and Web of Science combined^[48]. Second, because all articles listed in PubMed are simultaneously indexed in Scopus, PubMed is completely comprehensive in Scopus. As a result, Scopus is thought to be comprehensive, as it includes papers from both PubMed and Web of Science ^[46, 47]. Third, Scopus publishes publications in various disciplines, including science, technology, medicine, social science, and arts and humanities. Fourth, Scopus enables academics to create sophisticated and extensive search queries by combining various Boolean operators. Finally, Scopus enables the researcher to export and examine the data that has been retrieved. This comprises mapping and statistical analysis.”

Figure 2 includes some cities such as Hong Kong should be changed and other relative calculations.

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We corrected it. See Figure 1 and Table 1

The current work provides an overview ... and to determine > determines.

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We corrected it.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision



Specific Comments to Authors: Reviewer comments for the World Journal of Gastroenterology-75215. The authors described the overview of the research studies in recent ten years regarding nutrition and gut microbiota worldwide. It is an interesting and meaningful review study.

Response: I would like to thank you for the thorough reading of the manuscript and the professional comments and constructive recommendations, which help improve this manuscript's quality.

However, some small issues should be revised, detailed as follows:

1. Please do not use “microbiota” and “microbiome” indiscriminately. In fact, the meaning of “microbiota” and “microbiome” is not identical. Generally, microbiota refers to the community of micro-organisms themselves. Microbiome refers to the collective genomes of the micro-organisms in a particular environment.

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We corrected it.

2. In figure 2, the country name of the United States is missing.

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We corrected it.

3. In table 2, the institute of Ranking 1st and 2nd seems error. Although many labs and institutes from different universities are authenticated by the “Ministry of Education” or “Ministry of Agriculture of China”, the “Ministry of Education China” and “Ministry of Agriculture of China” are only administrative organizations, not an academy.

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We deleted them because they are overloaded with other institutes of China.

Reviewer #3:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: Summary Zyoud et al. performed bibliometric analysis showing global research landscape on nutrition and the gut microbiome. Although the authors showed a landscape and research trends on nutrition and gut microbiome, there are some major points to be revised.



Response: I would like to thank you for the thorough reading of the manuscript and the professional comments and constructive recommendations, which help improve this manuscript's quality.

- 1) MATERIALS AND METHODS; Considering the large heterogeneity of nutrition and the gut microbiome, the authors should show the ultimate aims and goals of this research (Santos et al. *Scientometrics*. 2022 Jan 16;1-34).

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We added it (see methods Page 8).

- 2) MATERIALS AND METHODS- Bibliometric analysis; There is a possibility that certain publication, and/or data collecting biases are existing in this manuscript. The authors should show that there are no biases shown above (Ono et al. *Biomedicines*. 2021 May 20;9(5):582).

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We added it (see methods Page 8 and Page 9).

- 3) RESULTS- Number of publications and evolution over time; The authors showed that 78.52% of research articles and 15.25% of reviews were included in this study. However, it seems that there are also some clinical trials and case series/case reports should be included (Johnstone et al. *Nutrients*. 2021 Dec 8;13(12):4384; Kageyama et al. *Nutrients*. 2021 Dec 14;13(12):4466.). Also, the author should show the numbers or percentage of the clinical/basic study included in this analysis.

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We added it (see results Page 10).

- 4) RESULTS- Journal analysis; In this section, the authors showed the active journals lists from 2012-2021. However, it is not always adequate that the number of publication reflects the activity of the journal. I recommend that the journal lists should be corrected and stratified by the journal impact factor or other journal quality indicators (Santos et al. *Scientometrics*. 2022 Jan 16;1-34).

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We added it (see methods Page 10 and Table 5).



Editor comments

This manuscript explored trends in nutrition and gut microbiome research by analyzing research on nutrition and gut microbiota. It is recommended to include more references on this topic, including search the databases of Web of Science and Google Scholar; the meaning of "microbiota" and "microbiome" is not identical, please verify the full text to confirm. Please revise and supplement Figure 2 further

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Response: I would like to thank you for the thorough reading of the manuscript and the professional comments and constructive recommendations, which help improve this manuscript's quality. We corrected all the comments

Company editor-in-chief:

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Gastroenterology, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted.

Response: thank you for this decision

I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.

Response: Dear editor, thank you very much for the comments and suggestions. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to improve and resubmit our manuscript. The comments and suggestions are valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our manuscript. According to the referees' comments and suggestions, we have made revisions, as described in the authors' response.



Please be sure to use Reference Citation Analysis (RCA) when revising the manuscript. RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. For details on the RCA, please visit the following web site: <https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/>.

Response: very thanks for this suggestion. We used it (see methods Page 10 and Table 5).

Please provide decomposable Figures (in which all components are movable and editable), organize them into a single PowerPoint file.

Response: we added all the figures to PPT

Please authors are required to provide standard three-line tables, that is, only the top line, bottom line, and column line are displayed, while other table lines are hidden. The contents of each cell in the table should conform to the editing specifications, and the lines of each row or column of the table should be aligned. Do not use carriage returns or spaces to replace lines or vertical lines and do not segment cell content.

Response: we adjusted the tables as you recommended

In order to respect and protect the author's intellectual property rights and prevent others from misappropriating figures without the author's authorization or abusing figures without indicating the source, we will indicate the author's copyright for figures originally generated by the author, and if the author has used a figure published elsewhere or that is copyrighted, the author needs to be authorized by the previous publisher or the copyright holder and/or indicate the reference source and copyrights. Please check and confirm whether the figures are original (i.e. generated de novo by the author(s) for this paper). If the picture is 'original', the author needs to add the following copyright information to the bottom right-hand side of the picture in PowerPoint (PPT): Copyright ©The Author(s) 2022. If an author of a submission is re-using a figure or figures published elsewhere, or that is copyrighted, the author must provide



documentation that the previous publisher or copyright holder has given permission for the figure to be re-published; and correctly indicating the reference source and copyrights. For example, "Figure 1 Histopathological examination by hematoxylin-eosin staining (200 ×). A: Control group; B: Model group; C: Pioglitazone hydrochloride group; D: Chinese herbal medicine group. Citation: Yang JM, Sun Y, Wang M, Zhang XL, Zhang SJ, Gao YS, Chen L, Wu MY, Zhou L, Zhou YM, Wang Y, Zheng FJ, Li YH. Regulatory effect of a Chinese herbal medicine formula on non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. *World J Gastroenterol* 2019; 25(34): 5105-5119. Copyright ©The Author(s) 2019. Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc[6]". And please cite the reference source in the references list. If the author fails to properly cite the published or copyrighted picture(s) or table(s) as described above, he/she will be subject to withdrawal of the article from BPG publications and may even be held liable.

Response: All our figures were original. We followed your suggestions.