PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 84092

Title: The current global research landscape on COVID-19 and liver dysfunction

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06388528

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Palestine

Manuscript submission date: 2023-02-24

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-04-29 02:44

Reviewer performed review: 2023-05-05 13:45

Review time: 6 Days and 11 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this paper, liver-related publications in COVID-19 studies over the past three years were collected and analyzed through SciVerse Scopus database. The data are sufficiently reliable and clear, which provides certain reference value for policymakers and researchers to prioritize and allocate resources in this research field. However, there are still some deficiencies:

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. After revising our manuscript to address the reviewers' Comment, we have had it rechecked by a native speaker of English. As a consequence, many minor grammatical and stylistic edits have been made throughout the text. We hope that this revised manuscript meets your expectations.

1. Bibliographic database："As mentioned, this approach may slightly reduce the level of sensitivity, meaning that some relevant articles that do not have a "liver" in their titles may be missed ."It is suggested to further discuss whether this method can be improved and why it should be used.

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. I added the validation of tool

2. The colors of the connecting lines in Figure 1 represent the suggested supplementary instructions.

   Response: Thank you for this suggestion. I added more information to be clear

3. "According to the centrality measures used in the map, the United States appears to be the most central country in terms of collaborations, followed by Italy." Lack of literature support, suggest supplement.

   Response: Thank you for this suggestion. I added more information to be clear (see the discussion)

4. "The United States and China have dominated research output in numerous fields, including the health sciences." The supporting literature is insufficient, and it is suggested to supplement.

   Response: Thank you for this suggestion. I added more information to be clear (see the discussion)

5. Abstract: The background introduction is too simple, and it is suggested to expand further.

   Response: Thank you for this suggestion. I added more information to be clear (see the abstract)

6. It is recommended to add a legend to Figure 2.

   Response: Thank you for this suggestion. I added more information to be clear

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I would like to provide some suggestions to improve your text.

1- I recommend reconsidering the phrase "The current global research landscape..." as it may not be necessary. Instead, you could revise the title to "Research Landscape on COVID-19 and Liver Dysfunction: A Bibliometric Analysis."

   Response: Thank you for this suggestion. I modified it as you suggested

2- The methods section in the abstract should be rewritten to enhance clarity. It currently appears confusing. Try to provide a more concise and straightforward description of your methodology.

   Response: Thank you for this suggestion. I added more information to be clear (see the methods)

3- It would be beneficial for you to include the keywords used in the Scopus engine, as well as a flowchart or diagram illustrating the search mechanisms and filters employed in your study. This additional information will enhance the transparency and reproducibility of your research.

   Response: Thank you for this suggestion. I added the final search query (see the method)

4- Certain parts of the discussion appear repetitive and require revision. For instance, you could consider rephrasing sentences or paragraphs that express similar ideas. By doing so, you will improve the overall coherence and quality of your manuscript. "The findings indicate that the United States, China, and Italy have been actively involved in COVID-19 and liver dysfunction research and have produced many publications on the subject. Nemours studies on the productivity of COVID-19 research in various fields [25, 26, 50-57], as measured by publications, found that the United States, China, and Italy were the leading producers of COVID-19 publications during this period of time." "The results of this study indicate that the USA, China, and Italy have been actively engaged in research related to COVID-19 and liver dysfunction and have produced a significant number of publications on the topic. Although no bibliometric study on research related to COVID-19 and the liver has been published, Nemours studies have been conducted on COVID-19 research productivity in various fields [25, 26, 50-57], as measured by publications, and found that the USA, China, and Italy were the top producers of COVID-19 publications during this time. The United States and China have indeed been leading research output in many fields, including the scientific field." These funding opportunities allow researchers to pursue ambitious research projects and recruit the brightest minds to work on these vital health issues. These funding opportunities enable researchers to pursue ambitious research projects and attract the brightest minds to work on these critical health issues.

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. I modified it as you suggested (see the discussion

5- I would recommend reviewing the remaining parts of the discussion section as they appear repetitive and do not provide substantial contributions to the overall discussion. It is essential for the authors to rewrite these sections to ensure clarity, conciseness, and relevance. By doing so, the discussion will be more coherent and impactful.

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. I modified it as you suggested

6- "A 2022 study published in the World Journal of Gastroenterology found that elevated levels of alanine aminotransferase" – It is important to provide accurate information about the study and its findings, but it is crucial to avoid any language that may imply biased promotion or manipulation of the publication process. By referencing the study in a neutral and objective manner, you maintain the integrity of your work and adhere to ethical standards in scientific research.

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. I modified it as you suggested

7- "according to previous similar studies, our study had several limitations" "in line with previous similar studies, our study had several limitations" why "our" study if only one author was listed and it appeared to be the one who did everything himself?

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. I modified it as you suggested

Dear editor

Editor-in-Chief

 Hope this finds you well

Re: Revised Manuscript Submission (Manuscript No: 84092)

We would like to express our sincere gratitude for taking the time to review our manuscript and for providing us with such insightful and constructive feedback. Your and reviewers' comments and recommendations have been extremely valuable to us, and we truly appreciate the effort and dedication you have put into reviewing our work.

Your thorough reading of the manuscript and your professional comments have greatly helped us to improve the quality of our work. We were impressed by the depth of your analysis and the attention you paid to even the smallest details. Your suggestions have guided us in refining our arguments, clarifying our explanations, and presenting our ideas more effectively.

We cannot thank you enough for your contribution to our manuscript. Your support has been instrumental in helping us to achieve our goals, and we are grateful for your willingness to share your expertise and knowledge with us. We hope that we can continue to collaborate in the future and that your feedback will help us to create even better work.

Our responses to the comments are highlighted in yellow in the revised manuscript. We carefully addressed all comments of the reviewers. A point-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

Editor comments

- I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, the relevant ethics documents, and the English Language Certificate, 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 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

9

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

- Before final acceptance, when revising the manuscript, the author must supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript. To this end, authors are advised to apply a new tool, the Reference Citation Analysis (RCA). RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. In it, upon obtaining search results from the keywords entered by the author, "Impact Index Per Article" under "Ranked by" should be selected to find the latest highlight articles, which can then be used to further improve an article under preparation/peer-review/revision. Please visit our RCA database for more information at: https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/.
  Response: very thanks for this suggestion. We used it (see methods Page 6, and Table 5).