



July 2, 2021

Dear editor

Editor-in-Chief

Hope this finds you well

Re: Revised Manuscript Submission (Manuscript No: 67000)

We would like to thank you and all reviewers for your time and insightful and qualified comments after reviewing our manuscript titled “**Global trends in research related to sleeve gastrectomy: a bibliometric and visualized study**”.

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 Gastrointestinal Surgery.

Yours sincerely

Sa’ed Zyoud

Reviewer reports:

Reviewer #1:

This is a good bibliometric study about sleeve gastrectomy. It shows the research features and hot spots in this field. I suggest that the title of the top 20 cited articles should be given. I think the title is more meaningful than the journal source.

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 included the title of the top 20 cited articles as you suggested .

Science editor:

1 Scientific quality: The manuscript performed a bibliometric analysis to evaluate the research activity in sleeve gastrectomy over the last two decades, and to visualize the hot spots and emerging trends in this type of bariatric surgery. The topic is within the scope of the World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery(WJGS). (1) Classification: Grade C(Good); (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: This is a good bibliometric study about sleeve gastrectomy. It shows the research features and hot spots in this field. I suggest that the title of the top 20 cited articles should be given. I think the title is more meaningful than the journal source; (3) Format: There are 4 tables and 4 figures; (4) References: A total of 85 references are cited, including 34 references published in the last 3 years; (5) Self-cited references: There are 4 self-cited references. The self-referencing rate should be less than 10%. Please keep the reasonable self-citations (i.e. those which are most closely related to the topic of the manuscript) and remove all other improper self-citations. If the authors fail to address the critical issue of self-citation, the editing process of this manuscript will be terminated; (6) References recommendations: The authors have the right to refuse to cite improper references recommended by the peer reviewer(s), especially those published by the peer reviewer(s) him/herself (themselves). If the authors find the peer reviewer(s) request for the authors to cite improper references published by him/herself (themselves), please send the peer reviewer's ID number to editorialoffice@wjgnet.com. The Editorial Office will close and remove the peer reviewer from the F6Publishing system immediately.

Response: I would like to thank you for the thorough reading of the manuscript and constructive recommendations, which help improve this manuscript's quality. I answered the questions raised by the reviewers as they recommended. Self-citations were less than 10% and all related to this type of studies.

2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade A. A language editing letter issued by the corresponding authors has been provided. In this letter, the author declared that the full manuscript has been reviewed by a native speaker. However, the



author did not provide the name of native speaker, and the certificate/declaration of the native speaker. Therefore, the authors should provide this information. '

Response: We thank you and reviewer for his/her thoughtful review of our work and kind words. In addition, we attached certificate for language of editing.

3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the Biostatistics Review Certificate. A Biostatistics Review Certificate letter issued by the corresponding authors has been provided. In this letter, the author declared that the full manuscript has been reviewed by members of bibliometricians and biomedical researchers as experts in this field worldwide. However, the authors did not provide the names, the certificate/declaration of the members. Therefore, the authors should provide this information. The authors have no financial disclosures or conflicts of interest to declare. As this is a bibliometric study, without human involvement, there was no need for ethics approval.

Response: we attached Biostatistics Review Certificate as you recommended.

4 Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. No financial support was obtained for the study. The topic has not previously been published in the WJGS.

Response: We are very thanks for this encouraging comment.

5 Issues raised: (1) The "Article Highlights" section is missing. Please add the "Article Highlights" section at the end of the main text (and directly before the References); (2) The certificate of Language Editing; (3) The certificate of Biostatistics Review.

Response: We added all the requirement.

6 Re-Review: Required.

Response: 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.

7 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

Response: We are very thanks for this encouraging comment.