

## Top 50 Most Cited Articles on Prostatic Artery Embolization for Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia, a Bibliometric Review.

### Responses to reviewer commentary

#### Reviewer #1

This review article is an interesting bibliometric evaluation of the status of prostatic artery embolization for benign prostatic hyperplasia. The rationale, methods, analysis, and discussion are well-presented.

Thank you for your time spent reviewing the manuscript and your feedback on these points.

Minor suggestions are warranted as following:

1) Clarification whether the major proportions of citations were for negation versus favourability of the procedure.

Thank you for raising this point, the vast majority of the articles we analyzed favored the procedure. We have added to the results section to address this additional analysis. Please see our changes highlighted in yellow.

2) Clarification of the percentages of self and non-self citations.

This is a great point, and we thank you for suggesting this additional analysis. 14.7% of all citations among these 50 articles were self-citations. The mean number of self-citations for an article in the top 50 was 11.4. Many of these articles likely represent landmark papers on the topic and the earliest work of several influential research groups. Therefore, it is somewhat expected that they would have several self-citations. Please see our updated results and discussion sections for additional details, our changes are highlighted in yellow. Thank you again for this very helpful suggestion.

Thank you for taking the time to provide your valuable feedback on our manuscript.

#### Reviewer #2

Personally, this article lacks certain innovation on the whole, and the conclusion has little significance for clinical practice. In addition, there are two suggestions as follows.

We appreciate you taking the time to review the manuscript and providing your valuable perspective. The authors do however respectfully disagree with these points. A bibliometric analysis of this kind has not been performed on this topic and we feel

that the findings may be helpful for clinical researchers working to innovate treatment strategies.

1. How does the author rate each study (level of evidence) ? This should be specified clearly.

We appreciate this feedback. The level of evidence was determined according to the 2018 JVIR methodology update in accordance with the Oxford Centre for Evidence-based Medicine (references 9 and 10) as described in our methods. We hope that this addresses your concern.

2. As a professional academic exchange, I think there are too many figures in the article, and these data information can be reflected in fewer tables, which is more concise and saves space.

Thank you for this feedback. While the authors do concede that there are quite a few figures, we feel that all of them contribute significantly to the manuscript. The figures allow for graphical representation of a large amount of information. In this way we feel that the figures make the discussion and results more concise as their contents would otherwise need to be outlined in the body of the manuscript. If space is a concern we feel that the figures do not need to be particularly large to convey adequately the required information. Thank you again for these comments.

Thank you for your time and effort revising our manuscript.