

Dear Dr. Ze-Mao Gong,

In reply to your last letter about 9 steps for resubmission (Manuscript NO: 27663-manuscript revision), I would like to say that we have downloaded the manuscript file edited by the editor and all regulations for resubmission were considered.

We appreciate editor and reviewers very much for their positive and constructive comments and suggestions on our manuscript. All the concerns of three reviewers have been responded one by one and have made revision which marked in red in the updated version of the manuscript (under revised state of word). Attached please find the revised version.

Thank you and best regards.

Yours sincerely,

Xiaohui Xiang

Response to Editor's comments:

For manuscripts submitted by non-native speakers of English, please provided language certificate by professional English language editing companies mentioned in 'The Revision Policies of BPG for Article'.

Response: The language and grammar have been revised by us and our English-speaking friends.

Provide and perfect the information including: Name of Journal, ESPS Manuscript NO, Manuscript Type, Running title, Data sharing statement, etc.

Response: We have made material complete followed detailed writing requirements.

Attention to standard format and word limit in Abstract.

Response: Abstract has been adjusted according to the instruction by editor.

Response: We have followed the guidelines given above to prepare the figures.

Response to reviewers' comments:

Reviewer: 1

Comments to the Authors

The manuscript "A Bibliometric Analysis on Top 100 Cited Articles in Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease Research" is suitable for publication after deeply revising the language and grammar.

Response: Thank you for your approval. The language and grammar have been revised by us and our English-speaking friends.

Specific comments: pag. 6 Univ Bologna, Univ Turin, Univ Sydney and Univ Calif San Diego -Incorrect use of short term "Univ".

Response: We are very sorry for our incorrect writing of short term "Univ". The word "Univ" in pag 6 and Table 3 have been replaced for unabridged phraseology "University".

References must be properly completed, as required.

Response: The references were also revised according to request of journal.

Reviewer: 2

Comments to the Authors

A Bibliometric Analysis on Top 100 Cited Articles in Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease Research The present study is very interesting on a high prevalent chronic liver disease.

Response: Thank you for the appreciation of the subject matter of the manuscript.

There are some errors on the abbreviations along the text.

Response: This is similar to Reviewer 1's comment. We are very sorry for our negligence of abbreviations. Page 6 and Table 3, the abbreviations "Univ" have been corrected as "University". The abbreviations "MS" everywhere along the manuscript have been corrected as "metabolic syndrome".

The table 6 is not important.

Response: It is really true as reviewer suggested that a majority of frequent key words listed in Table 6 and Table 7 are approximately reduplicate, so Table 6 has been deleted. Correspondingly, the paragraph on 2 Method (page 5) and 3.5 The research hotspots of NAFLD (page 8) has been re-edited.

The discussion is too long at the present form and redundant (8 pages?). I suggest to rewrite this section

Response:

We have re-written this part according to the reviewer's suggestion. As a result, the discussion has been shortened from 8 and a half pages to 5 pages (due to extensive change of framework, we didn't mark revision of 4.2 in red in the revised paper to present visual cleanliness).

Reviewer: 3

Comments to the Authors

This study retrieved the 100 top-cited articles in the field of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease and determines the country of origin, peak of highly-cited articles and international collaborations. Major Points The list is of interest, but the authors have analysed the topics covered using frequency of keywords. It would be more useful to determine the topics of the articles by reading them and then discuss the themes and findings.

Response: We admit that as reviewer pointed out, keywords used by bibliometrics can't abstract themes and findings as exactly as reading original

articles, and we have made objective and discreet phraseology in Discussion 4.2, page 10: "Highly related concepts and top keywords could partly reflect the profile of hotspots in NAFLD research." Actually, bibliometrics could serve to trace the direction and breakthrough of hotspots more efficiently. Analysis on highly related concepts is of value to a certain extent.

The discussion is long and often does not relate directly to the articles that the authors have selected in their top 100.

Response: This is similar to Reviewer 2's comment. We have deleted the part which is not relate directly to frequent concepts and top keywords of top 100, resulting in obvious shortening of discussion (from 8 and a half pages to 5 pages). In addition, we have added citation of top 100 in reference.

They resort to topics that may or may not be important (the discussion of herbal therapies is a case in point) and refer to recent reviews in secondary journals rather than the primary and important articles that they have identified.

Response: We have re-written the discussion and deleted the part which is not be important (e.g. herbal therapies, intestinal flora, animal model, etc.). We have replaced the citation of some secondary articles with primary articles in reference. However, we reserve several bibliometric and review articles out of necessity in discussion.

The English usage is not always easily understandable and grammar needs review.

Response: The language and grammar have been revised by us and our English-speaking friends. Some abbreviations (e.g. Univ, MS, etc) have been replaced for unabridged phraseology for easily being understood.