PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 84092

Title: Research landscape on COVID-19 and liver dysfunction: A bibliometric analysis

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Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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: 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.   2. The colors of the connecting lines in Figure 1 represent the suggested supplementary instructions.   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.   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.   5. Abstract: The background introduction is too simple, and it is suggested to expand further.   6. It is

recommended to add a legend to Figure 2.

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."   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.   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.   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.   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.   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.   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?

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

Manuscript NO: 84092

Title: Research landscape on COVID-19 and liver dysfunction: A bibliometric analysis

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06228122

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: Palestine

Manuscript submission date: 2023-02-24

Reviewer chosen by: Li Li

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-06-19 20:55

Reviewer performed review: 2023-06-19 21:09

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

No additional comments.