Dear Editor,

On behalf of my coauthors, I appreciate the constructive comments and positive suggestions regarding our manuscript from the editors and reviewers very much. We would now like to resubmit the revised manuscript. Attached is a point-by-point response to each comment related to manuscript #87041 raised by the reviewers and editorial office. Changes are also marked in red in the revised manuscript.

We thank you for your excellent work in evaluating the manuscript and look forward to your replies at your earliest convenience.

Yours sincerely,

Professor Xiaojiang Zhou

First of all, we would like to express our sincere gratitude to the editor and reviewers and for their constructive and positive comments.

**Reviewer(s) Comments to Author**

**Reviewer 1**

**Comments to the Author:** Thank you for the invitation. This study is a bibliometric article, aiming to elucidate the changes, development trends and research hotspots of intestinal barrier research in inflammatory bowel disease. I would like to congratulate the authors for their interesting work. I have some issues to discuss with the authors before publication.

**1. 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.**

**Response:** Thank you for your suggestions. We greatly appreciate your emphasis on clarity and reader comprehension. We have provided a comprehensive explanation of the bibliometric metric and their significance, with a focus on improving clarity for all readers. These studies did provide a valuable reference for us to improve the legibility of the manuscript, and we have added them in the methods section.

**2. 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.**

**Response:** Thank you for your suggestions. We fully agree with your point regarding the figure legends. It is essential to provide detailed descriptions for each figure, taking into consideration that readers may have varying levels of familiarity with the diagrams. In response to your suggestion, we have carefully revised the figure legends to ensure that they provide comprehensive explanations for each figure.

**3. The authors need to explain why they use the WOS database/Pubmed instead of Scopus or others. You can refer to the following studies and cite them: PMID: 35784740, PMID: 36148235**

**Response:** Thank you for your suggestions. The Web of Science (WOS) database and PubMed were selected due to their comprehensive coverage of scholarly literature and accurate citation data, enabling multidisciplinary and comprehensive research evaluation. While we acknowledge the value of Scopus and other databases as well, we maintain that the WOS database and PubMed are more closely aligned with the focus and scope of our study. They provide the necessary breadth and depth of information to effectively address our research questions. We have added this part to the manuscript and cited the relevant literature.

**4. 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."**

**Response:** Thank you for your suggestion. we have thoroughly revised the discussion section, reorganizing and streamlining the content to ensure a coherent and logical structure. We also acknowledge the significance of presenting information in a manner that guides readers towards key points and insights while avoiding unnecessary complexity.

**5. 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?**

**Response:** Thank you for addressing a pertinent concern. The inclusion of "keywords plus" does indeed increase the likelihood of irrelevant publications being included, potentially affecting the specificity of the search. However, this broader approach also enhances the chance of capturing a wider range of relevant publications that might not be indexed with conventional keywords alone. Ensuring the integrity of data during its collection at the source is, to some extent, more important than its accuracy. Compared to the continuous refinement and purification of raw retrieval results, irrelevant research topics may automatically surface during subsequent knowledge graph analysis, which can be rectified through parameter adjustments. Nevertheless, our methodology endeavors to strike a balance between comprehensiveness and accuracy of results, ensuring the reliability and validity of our findings.

.

**6. Since there are a lot of data in this study, the author should check carefully to make sure the correct.**

**Response:** Thank you for your suggestion. We have thoroughly reviewed the extensive dataset used in this study to ensure its accuracy and correctness. Our meticulous verification process includes cross-referencing and validation steps to minimize the possibility of errors.

**Reviewer 2**

**Comments to the Author:** In this paper, the authors conducted bibliometric analysis and visualization concerning intestinal barrier research in inflammatory bowel disease using VOSviewer, CiteSpace and R software, and they concluded that intestinal barrier field is developing rapidly with extensive cooperation. The topic is interesting and the paper is well written. However, I suggest that the authors address the following points. 3. The authors should explain the abbreviations, AMP, and TS.

**1. I suggest that the authors explain about the bibliometric analysis in the section of Introduction or Methods.**

**Response:** Thank you for your suggestion. We have taken your recommendation into consideration and have incorporated an explanation of the bibliometric analysis, along with relevant indicators in the Methods section. This addition provides a comprehensive overview of the methodology we employed and helps readers understand the rationale behind our approach.

**2. I suggest that a more detailed explanation of the figures should be given in the Figure legends.**

**Response:** Thank you for your suggestion. We have carefully reviewed and revised the figure legends to provide a more detailed explanation of each figure, as you suggested. These enhancements also aim to ensure that readers have a clearer understanding of the content and context of each figure.

**3. The authors should explain the abbreviations, AMP, and TS.**

**Response:** Thank you for your suggestion. We have provided explanations for the abbreviations "AMP" and "TS" in the manuscript. Furthermore, we have thoroughly reviewed the manuscript to ensure that all important abbreviations are appropriately explained upon their first mention.