

Dear Prof. Lian-Sheng Ma, Editors, and Reviewers,

Thank you for your letter and for the comments concerning our manuscript entitled “Biologic Therapy for Crohn Disease over the Last Three Decades: Bibliometric Analysis from the Most Influential Original Articles” (**Manuscript NO.: 70621, SCIENTOMETRICS**). Those comments were valuable and helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. We provided a comprehensive response to all comments made by the reviewers point by point in the following pages. The revised portions were marked in red in the revised manuscript. The important changes made in the manuscript were as follows:

- The title was changed as “Biologic Therapy for Crohn Disease over the Last Three Decades”.
- The original figure documents were uploaded as a file (70621-Image File) in the revision process.
- The approved grant application forms were uploaded as a file (70621-Approved Grant Application Forms) in the revision process.
- “*Article Highlights*” section was added.
- “*References*” section was revised (all ≤ 3 references from the same journal).
- The manuscript was polished by a native English speaker, and grammatical errors were corrected throughout the manuscript.
- Authors list was updated. We added two authors (Ji-Liang Shen and Xu Feng), and the Corresponding author was changed as Xu Feng.

We deeply appreciate your consideration of our manuscript, and thanks for the editors and reviewers’ constructive advice. If you have any questions, please don’t hesitate to contact me at the address below. Looking forward to receiving your feedback soon. Thank you very much!

Best regards,

Yours sincerely,

Xu Feng, MD, PhD, Surgeon

Department of General Surgery, Sir Run-Run Shaw Hospital, Zhejiang University, No.3 East Qingchun Road, Hangzhou 310016, Zhejiang Province, China.

Email: phoneshe@zju.edu.cn

Tel: 86-571-86006617

Fax: 86-571-86044817

Lian-Sheng Ma, Company editor-in-chief

Remarks to Authors

Comments (Q1): *“Change the title as ‘Biologic Therapy for Crohn Disease over the Last Three Decades’.”*

Response: Thank you for your valuable suggestions, and the title was changed as “Biologic Therapy for Crohn Disease over the Last Three Decades” on Pages 1-2.

Comments (Q2): *“I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Clinical Cases, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. 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: Thanks for your comments! We provided a comprehensive response to all comments made by editors and reviewers point by point, and the revised portions were marked in red in the revised manuscript.

Comments (Q3): *“Before final acceptance, uniform presentation should be used for figures showing the same or similar contents; for example, “Figure 1 Pathological changes of atrophic gastritis after treatment. A: ...; B: ...; C: ...; D: ...; E: ...; F: ...; G: ...”. Please provide decomposable Figures (in which all components are movable and editable), organize them into a single PowerPoint file.”*

Response: Considering your helpful suggestions, uniform presentation were used for figures in the manuscript. And a single PowerPoint file including all decomposable Figures and editable figure legends was provided (70621-Image File). Notably, Figure 2 was consisted of 2 original images, while other Figures were exactly the original images.

Comments (Q4): *“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: Based on your suggestions, all Tables were provided as standard three-line tables, and the contents of each cell in Tables conformed to the editing specifications without using carriage returns or spaces.

Science Editor Comments to Authors

Comments (Brief comments): *"1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a scientometrics of the biologic therapy for Crohn disease over the last three decades. The topic is within the scope of the WJCC. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Two Grades B. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the Biostatistics Review Certificate. No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. The study was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China. The topic has not previously been published in the WJCC. 5 Re-Review: Not required. 6 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance. Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing); Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)."*

Response: Thanks for your remarks. We modified our manuscript based on your suggestions and comments, and we believe that the quality of our manuscript were significantly improved.

Comments (Q1): *"The authors did not provide the approved grant application form(s). Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s)."*

Response: Thank you for your suggestions. We are very sorry for our negligence of not providing the approved grant application forms. And therefore, we uploaded them as a file (70621-Approved Grant Application Forms) in the revision process.

Comments (Q2): *"The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor."*

Response: Thank you for your suggestions. We are very sorry for our negligence of not providing the original figure documents. And a single PowerPoint file including all decomposable Figures and editable figure

legends was provided (70621-Image File). Notably, Figure 2 was consisted of 2 original images, while other Figures were exactly the original images.

Comments (Q3): *“The “Article Highlights” section is missing. Please add the “Article Highlights” section at the end of the main text.”*

Response: We feel sorry for our negligence of not offering “Article Highlights” section, and therefore, we added this part on Pages 19-20:

“ARTICLE HIGHLIGHTS

Research background

There is an overloading amount of publications on biologic therapy for Crohn disease (CD).

Research motivation

No comprehensive analysis of biologic therapy for CD has been reported.

Research objectives

The objective of the study was to determine knowledge gaps and identify areas of interest of biologic therapy for CD.

Research methods

We conducted a bibliometric analysis of biologic therapy for CD based on the top 100 highest-cited original articles, summarized the bibliographic information, and explored the research hotspots.

Research results

The 2000s yielded the most influential original articles and saw the most dramatic growth. The USA and Europe contributed the most publications, and the cooperation relationships between them were most frequent. *Gastroenterology* has published the most articles on biologic therapy for CD. And the anti-TNF biologics and monoclonal antibodies were the most studied topics.

Research conclusions

The bibliometric analysis emphasized the key contributions made to the development of the specialized field.

Research perspectives

These data would provide useful research insights into biologic therapy for CD for clinicians and researchers.”.

Comments (Q4): *“It is unacceptable to have more than 3 references from the same journal. To resolve this issue and move forward in the peer-review/publication process, the authors must revise the reference list accordingly.”*

Response: Thanks for your valuable comments. We are very sorry for our weakness of citing more than 3 references from the same journal such as *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* (4) and *Gastroenterology* (8). To resolve the issue, we deleted some references and added some references from other journals. And the “*Reference*” section (all ≤ 3) was updated on Pages 21, 25, 26.

Reviewer Comments to Authors

Reviewer #1

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Comments (Brief comments): *“This is an interesting study about the biologic therapy for Crohn disease. The manuscript is very well written. Some minor language polishing should be corrected.”*

Response: Thank you for your valuable suggestions and comments, the manuscript was polished by a native English speaker, and grammatical errors were corrected throughout the manuscript.

For example, in *“Introduction”* section on Pages 7-8, *“a main type of inflammatory bowel disease (IBD)”* was corrected as *“the main type of inflammatory bowel disease (IBD)”*. *“therapy strategy”* was changed as *“therapeutic strategy”*. And *“via”* was changed as *“via”*.

In *“Material and methods”* section on Pages 8-10, *“systematical”* was corrected as *“systematic”*, *“Literature that did not focus on biologic therapy for CD”* was changed as *“Literature that was not related to biologic therapy for CD”*, and so on.

In *“Results”* section, *“randomised”* was changed as *“randomized”*, *“..., in other words...”* was changed as *“..., which meant that...”*, and so on.

In *“Discussion”* section, *“Especially in the year 2007”* was corrected as *“Especially in the year of 2007”*, *“and the related articles did not have much time to accumulate TC”* was changed as *“and the TC of related articles could not be accumulated within the limited time”*, *“have”* was changed as *“had”*, and *“is”* was corrected as *“was”*, and so on.

Reviewer Comments to Authors

Reviewer #2

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Comments (Brief comments): *“This is an original and informative study on published articles in the field of inflammatory bowel diseases. The topic is interesting and the manuscript is well written. English needs some improvement.”*

Response: Based on your helpful comments, the manuscript was polished by a native English speaker, and grammatical errors were corrected throughout the manuscript.

For example, in *“Introduction”* section on Pages 7-8, “a main type of inflammatory bowel disease (IBD)” was corrected as “**the** main type of inflammatory bowel disease (IBD)”. “therapy strategy” was changed as “**therapeutic** strategy”. And “via” was changed as “**via**”.

In *“Material and methods”* section on Pages 8-10, “systematical” was corrected as “**systematic**”, “Literature that did not focus on biologic therapy for CD” was changed as “Literature **that was not related to** biologic therapy for CD”, and so on.

In *“Results”* section, “randomised” was changed as “**randomized**”, “..., in other words...” was changed as “..., **which meant that**...”, and so on.

In *“Discussion”* section, “Especially in the year 2007” was corrected as “Especially in the year **of 2007**”, “and the related articles did not have much time to accumulate TC” was changed as “**and the TC of related articles could not be accumulated within the limited time**”, “have” was changed as “**had**”, and “is” was corrected as “**was**”, and so on.