

# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastroenterology* 

Manuscript NO: 88286

Title: Research status and hotspots of autoimmune gastritis: A bibliometric analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06287257

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Postdoc, Postdoctoral Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-09-20

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-09-26 00:36

Reviewer performed review: 2023-09-26 00:46

Review time: 1 Hour

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	[ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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



# Baishideng

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA Telephone: +1-925-399-1568 E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com

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	<ul> <li>[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ ] Minor revision [ Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection</li> </ul>
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

#### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for the invitation. This study aimed to conduct a bibliometric analysis about Autoimmune gastritis. I have the following suggestions. 1. The author only included 316 studies in this work. Why not conduct a system review directly? 2. Why the author chose 2012 as the beginning year? Not 2000 or 1900? 3. Please add reference co-citation analysis and cluster or timeline view map. 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. 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. 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 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. 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? 9.Since there are a lot of data in this study, the author should check carefully to make sure the correct.



# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastroenterology* 

Manuscript NO: 88286

Title: Research status and hotspots of autoimmune gastritis: A bibliometric analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00030847

**Position:** Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-09-20

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-09-20 13:44

Reviewer performed review: 2023-10-01 01:12

**Review time:** 10 Days and 11 Hours

	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C:
Scientific quality	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	<ul> <li>[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair</li> <li>[ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation</li> </ul>



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [] 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	<ul> <li>[ ] Accept (High priority)</li> <li>[ ] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ Y] Minor revision</li> <li>[ ] Major revision</li> <li>[ ] Rejection</li> </ul>
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous       [] Onymous         Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes       [Y] No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

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  $\rightarrow$  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.