

Reply to Reviewers

Dear Editor and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and the reviewers' comments concerning our manuscript entitled "**Intestinal barrier in inflammatory bowel disease: A bibliometric analysis**" (Manuscript number: 88750). These comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our research. We have studied comments carefully and have made corrections which we hope meet with approval. We used track changes mode to revise part of the manuscript. We have revised and resubmitted the revised manuscript. The main corrections in the paper and the responses to the reviewer's comments are as follows:

Responds to the reviewer's comments:

Reviewer #1:

1. The primary aim of the authors of this letter is to explore the development of IBD-related intestinal barrier research and the major research foci. Publications related to the topic were retrieved from the SCI-EXPANDED database. Through statistical analysis, they found that 7344 English-language articles were published between January 1, 2001, and December 31, 2021, which met the criteria for analysis. Most studies came from China. A key observation was that the importance of the gut barrier in the pathogenesis of IBD was recognized. This, in turn, opened up a new therapeutic perspective. Significant fluctuations in the number of publications can indeed have a major impact on various scientometric and quantitative aspects. For this reason, it is concluded that the appropriate search formula is very important as it serves as a basis for unbiased bibliometric analysis. Their fundamental and important point is that expert consultation on search keywords tailored to a specific field of study is always necessary and justified. I propose that the communication be accepted.

Author response and action taken: Thank you very much for recognizing our work! Thank you for your valuable feedback.

Reviewer #2

This is a very well written Letter to Editor concerning the recently published paper of Zhou et al. in WJG (2023) about the bibliometric and knowledge-map analysis of intestinal barrier in inflammatory bowel disease. In present Letter to Editor, the authors underline the importance of the study of intestinal barrier research in the context of inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) and analysis of the bibliometric investigation in this field. . The authors recommend pointing the attention to the melioration of search formula of literature. They strongly suggest incorporating synonymous terms and nomenclatures associated with “inflammatory bowel disease”. In this Letter to Editor, the authors give their suggestions for augmentation of precision and accuracy of data analysis pertaining to the research trend of “intestinal barrier in IBD”.

Author response and action taken: Thank you very much for recognizing our work! Thank you for your valuable feedback.

Reviewer #3:

Author response and action taken: First of all, thank you very much for the reviewer's opinion, but I think the reviewer did not look at this article fairly and impartially, first of all, the same article, reviewer #1 's suggestion is: Scientific Quality: **Grade B (Very good)** Language Quality: **Grade A (Priority publishing)**, Conclusion: **Accept (General priority)**, reviewer #2's suggestion is: Scientific Quality: **Grade A (Excellent)**, Language Quality: **Grade A (Priority publishing)**, Conclusion: **Accept (General priority)**, but reviewer #3 's suggestion is: Scientific Quality: **Grade E (Do not publish)**, Language Quality: **Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)**, **Conclusion: Rejection**. The fact that the reviewer gave a very different opinion is very unusual, and can only mean that the reviewer has strong personal emotions towards this article. The reviewer's opinion is full of hostility, even with some life attacks, indeed, the

author of this article is not as famous as the original author as the reviewer said, but this does not mean that the original author's work is impeccable. It is normal to have different search strategies for the same topic, and each author has a different starting point. We are just making a suggestion, not dismissing the significance of the original paper in its entirety. As for the deficiencies in our paper as mentioned by the reviewers (such as citation of relevant references, etc.), we will seriously revise the areas that are our negligence or imperfect work. On the whole, we think that the reviewer could not make an objective evaluation, so I do not want to reply too much to his suggestions. Thank you.

We tried our best to improve the manuscript and made some changes in the manuscript. These changes will not influence the content and framework of the paper. Here we did not list all the changes but marked in red by track changes mode in the revised paper.

We appreciate for Editors/Reviewers' work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval. We are open to any additional comments or concerns you may have regarding this adjustment or any other aspect of the paper. Your feedback is invaluable in improving the quality of our work. Thank you for your support.

Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.

Yours sincerely,

Yandong Miao