

We firstly thank the reviewer for his/her valuable comments. And also, we would like to thank Handling Editor for giving us the opportunity to revise our paper. We have read the comments from the reviewer carefully and extremely agree with his/her opinions and suggestions. We have made great efforts to modify and revise our paper as required.

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: Congratulations on the performed study. Their results are quite interesting, as well as it is a study of scientific relevance. Below, I highlight some suggestions for improvements for the final version of the article. * In general, the abstracts are composed by the following structure: contextualization, research problem, proposed solution, results and conclusion. Apparently, your abstract have not some summarized results and conclusion. I suggest review your abstract and adapt it for this structure. You could use the information in "Core tip" to update your abstract. * In fact, the linearity of JAII-JIF-CS is clear in lower-quality journals. But was it investigated the main reason of this non-linearity for higher-quality journals? * Regarding to their results, I think the authors could explore more deeply other types of analyses that has the same purpose of scientometric indexes comparison, based on state-of-art in Scientometrics/Bibliometrics. * The images' quality needs to be improved. In addition, I suggest increasing the font size of text in the charts. * More than half (11) of the references are outdated and/or wrongly written. * I suggest the inclusion of a "Threats to Validity" section, highlighting the threats related to the study performed. * The authors could include some future works in "Conclusion" section.

* In general, the abstracts are composed by the following structure: contextualization, research problem, proposed solution, results and conclusion. Apparently, your abstract have not some summarized results and conclusion. I suggest review your abstract and adapt it for this structure. You could use the information in "Core tip" to update your abstract.

Answer: Thank you for your suggestions. We extremely agree with you. We have revised our abstract as required.

* In fact, the linearity of JAII-JIF-CS is clear in lower-quality journals. But was it investigated the main reason of this non-linearity for higher-quality journals?

Answer: Thank you for your suggestions. We have added the part "Non-linearity interpretation" as required.

* Regarding to their results, I think the authors could explore more deeply other types of analyses that has the same purpose of scientometric indexes comparison, based on state-of-art in Scientometrics/Bibliometrics.

Answer: Thank you for your suggestions. We have seen that there are articles using Spearman correlations and Pearson correlations to compare different journal impact measures. However, these methods can only provide overall evaluation of Journal Impact Measures. We provide a visual method that can not only assess the overall distribution among these evaluation methods, but also show the trend of evaluation indicators changing with journal quality.

* The images' quality needs to be improved. In addition, I suggest increasing the font size of text in the charts.

Answer: Thank you for your advice. We have revised and checked as required.

* More than half (11) of the references are outdated and/or wrongly written.

Answer: Thank you for your suggestions. We extremely agree with you. We have revised and checked as required.

* I suggest the inclusion of a "Threats to Validity" section, highlighting the threats related to the study performed.

Answer: Thank you for your advice. We have added "Threats to Validity" section as required.

* The authors could include some future works in "Conclusion" section.

Answer: Thank you for your suggestions. We have included the future works as required.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade A (Excellent)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: The study is novel showing JAI as a timeless marker of journal impact. The paper is well conducted with eye catching figures. However the presence of 3 tables is very cumbersome. Please Combine the 3 tables 1,2,3 into one table with adding in the columns JAI, JIF and CS for each journal when available, and this would show the difference for each journal for these three parameters.

Answer: Thank you for your suggestions. We extremely agree with you. We have combined 3 tables into one presence.