

## Responses to the Comments of Reviewers

**Dear Professor,**

Thank you for the review of our manuscript (manuscript ID: 88286) entitled “Research Status and Hotspots of Autoimmune Gastritis: A Bibliometric Analysis”. Also, we are truly grateful to you for offering us the opportunity to resubmit our revised manuscript. We have completed the revisions to the manuscript and now report the modifications based on the review comments as follows.

**Reviewer 1:**

**This is a very interesting, valuable and truly scientometrics paper discussing the current topic of AIG. Although it has been proofread in English, some rather elementary errors are noticeable. For example, page 11, line 4 from the bottom of the line, "autoimmune mechanisms1718.", ",," missing, such typos are quite common. Table 4 Internal medicine → Internal Medicine, e.g. Reference 8 last author Haruma K is missing. This situation makes us a little uneasy, even though the data has been properly tabulated.**

**Answer:** We apologize for some elementary errors in the manuscript. In this revision, we have carefully reviewed the entire text and corrected the errors we found, and have applied language polishing services to improve the quality of the manuscript. Thank you for your invaluable guidance, which helped us realize the details of our own problems. [All modifications have been highlighted in yellow in the text.]

**Reviewer 2:**

**1. The author only included 316 studies in this work. Why not conduct a system review directly?**

**Answer:** The primary objective of this manuscript is to identify the key researchers and hot topics in the field of AIG. Bibliometric analysis is well-suited for exploring the trends and academic impact of a field compared to system review. This is due to the availability of large amounts of publication and citation data. Given the purpose of our study and the availability of data, we ultimately chose bibliometric analysis.

**2. Why the author chose 2012 as the beginning year? Not 2000 or 1900?**

**Answer:** We apologize for any confusion related to Figure 2. In fact, we included all relevant literature from 1969 to the present in our analysis, without imposing any limitations on the starting year for the included literature. We have revised Figure 2, and updated version now presents publication statistics from 1969 to the present.

[The modifications can be found in the section “**RESULTS - The trend of publication outputs**” on page 7 and **Figure 2** on page 31.]

**3. Please add reference co-citation analysis and cluster or timeline view map.**

**Answer:** We have added "RESULTS - Analysis of co-cited references" to "RESULTS". In this section, we included a cluster analysis diagram (Figure 9) along with a detailed description of the results obtained from the reference co-citation analysis.

[The modifications can be found in the section “**RESULTS - Analysis of co-cited references**” on page 11 to 12 and **Figure 9** on page 38.]

**4. Please expound on all relevant bibliometric indicators applied in this manuscript. Never assume the readers are familiar with them. I suggest the author read the following excellent studies and add them to the reference list. PMID: 36699067; PMID: 35346273.**

**Answer:** We are very grateful for the excellent papers you have provided, which has greatly benefited us. We have thoroughly studied these papers and cited them as references. Based on the guidance of these papers, we have incorporated an explanation of the role of all bibliometric indicators in "METHODS - Data collection and analysis".

[The modifications can be found in the section “**METHODS - *Data collection and analysis***” on page 6 to 7.]

**5. As for the figure legends, the author should give more descriptions about each figure. Do not assume that all readers are familiar with these diagrams.**

**Answer:** We have included detailed descriptions for Figures 3-Figure 9 in both the figure legends and the main text. This enhancement is intended to facilitate a clearer understanding of the illustrations for our readers.

[The modifications can be found in the section “**RESULTS**” on page 7 to 11, and **Figure 3 - Figure 8** on page 37.]

**6. The authors need to explain why they use the WOS database instead of Scopus or others. You can refer to the following studies and cite them: PMID: 35784740, PMID: 36148235**

**Answer:** Considering the advantages of WOS in terms of coverage, citation analysis, journal quality, standardized data and interdisciplinary research, we finally chose it as our data source. We supplemented this information into the “**METHODS - *Data sources and search strategy***” and cited these two references.

[The modifications can be found in the section “**METHODS - *Data sources and search strategy***” on page 6.]

**7. In the discussion section where the hot topics are discussed, there is quite loose and disordered structure which makes the readers quite confused. It's not “the more figures, the better.” I would like to know what the real hot topics are in this field.**

**Answer:** We have revised "Discussion - *Hot Topics and Frontiers*" by removing some less relevant content to make the ideas and logic of the section clearer. In this revision, we focused on the following five hot topics: (1) the role of *Helicobacter pylori* in the pathogenesis of AIG, (2) diagnostic criteria for AIG and the reference value of serum antibodies, (3) comorbidity mechanisms between AIG and other autoimmune diseases, (4) specific risks of AIG complicating gastric and other cancers, (5) the role of vitamin B12 supplementation in patients with early-stage AIG.

[The modifications can be found in the section “**DISCUSSION - *Hotspots and frontiers***” on page 16 to 20.]

**8. Several researchers believe that TS search is not suitable for bibliometric analysis, due to the include of “keywords plus” during the search process. Many unrelated publications could be included. What is your opinion?**

**Answer:** In order to obtain as much potential literature as possible, we used a TS search. However, inevitably, WOS provided a lot of irrelevant literature. To address this issue, we conducted a rigorous literature screening and comparison to ensure the relevance and quantity of our included literature.

**9. Since there are a lot of data in this study, the author should check carefully to make sure the correct.**

**Answer:** Thank you for your valuable advice. We have checked all the raw data, figures, tables, and texts to ensure the accuracy of the results based on your suggestions.

Thank you again for your guidance, which has greatly benefited us.

Should you find any issues that require revision in this manuscript, please do not hesitate to let us know.

Thank you.

Best regards,

Yunfeng Yu