



**ROUND 1**

May 22, 2022

Dear editor  
Editor-in-Chief

Hope this finds you well

**Re: Revised Manuscript Submission** (Manuscript No: 75217)

We would like to thank you and all reviewers for your time and insightful and qualified comments after reviewing our manuscript titled “**Mapping the landscape and structure of global research on binge eating disorder: Visualization and bibliometric analysis**”.

We wish to thank the editor and reviewers again for their time in commenting on the draft manuscript, which we believe has strengthened the paper. We carefully addressed all comments of the reviewers. A point-by--by-point reply to the comments is given below. We hope that we appropriately address all comments.

We look forward to you and reviewers’ comments on the manuscript and hope that the manuscript is given favorable consideration for publication in World Journal of Psychiatry.

Yours sincerely  
Sa’ed H Zyoud

**Reviewer reports:**

**Reviewer #1:**

**Scientific Quality:** Grade C (Good)

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Major revision

**Specific Comments to Authors:** This study provides a bibliometric analysis of the literature in areas related to BED research and uses a visualization tool to



map research patterns and trends, contributing to a comprehensive understanding of recent advances in BED research and identifying some future research directions.

Response: I would like to thank you for the thorough reading of the manuscript and thank you for the encouraging comments and constructive recommendations, which help improve this manuscript's quality.

Paragraphs 9-11 of the Discussion section should be simplified.

Response: we modified the discussion as you suggested

It is suggested that the five tables in the text be revised to three-line tables.

Response: we revised the tables as you suggested.

Reviewer #2:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade B (Very good)

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Minor revision

**Specific Comments to Authors:** Thank you for submitting your research to World Journal of Psychiatry. Overall, the paper is very well-written and it was a pleasure to read it.

Response: I would like to thank you for the thorough reading of the manuscript and thank you for the encouraging comments and constructive recommendations, which help improve this manuscript's quality.

Nevertheless, I suggest that the manuscript is proofread by a native English speaker or Editing service. So please make sure there are no English errors.

Response: We carefully checked the quality of English. A native English speaker has revised the manuscript

In addition, DSM-5 does not use the terms "eating disorders." Please replace them with "feeding and eating disorders." All in all, it is a good job.

Response: we modified the references as you suggested.



=====

**1) Science editor:**

The present paper provides a bibliographic analysis of the literature in fields relevant to BED research and contributes to a comprehensive understanding of recent advances in BED research and the identification of future research directions by mapping research patterns and trends using visualization tools. . Overall, this study is well written. The results are interesting. If the authors add more limitations in the discussion section, it may help readers understand.

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Response: I would like to thank you for the thorough reading of the manuscript and the professional comments and constructive recommendations, which help improve this manuscript's quality. We corrected all the comments and we added some limitations.

**(2) Company editor-in-chief:**

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Psychiatry, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted.

Response: thank you for this decision

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: Dear editor, thank you very much for the comments and suggestions. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to improve and resubmit our manuscript. The comments and suggestions are valuable and very helpful for

revising and improving our manuscript. According to the referees' comments and suggestions, we have made revisions, as described in the authors' response.

Please be in the METHODS be sure to use Reference Citation Analysis (RCA) when revising the manuscript. RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. For details on the RCA, please visit the following web site: <https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/>.

Response: very thanks for this suggestion. We used it (see abstract, methods and Table 5).

Please provide decomposable Figures (in which all components are movable and editable), organize them into a single PowerPoint file.

Response: we added all the figures to PPT

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: we adjusted the tables as you recommended

Please check and confirm whether the figures are original (i.e. generated de novo by the author(s) for this paper). If the picture is 'original', the author needs to add the following copyright information to the bottom right-hand side of the picture in PowerPoint (PPT): Copyright ©The Author(s) 2022. If an author of a submission is re-using a figure or figures published elsewhere, or that is copyrighted, the author must provide documentation that the previous publisher or copyright holder has given permission for the figure to be re-published; and correctly indicating the reference source and copyrights. For example, "Figure 1 Histopathological examination by hematoxylin-eosin staining (200 ×). A: Control group; B: Model group; C: Pioglitazone hydrochloride group; D: Chinese herbal medicine group. Citation: Yang JM, Sun Y, Wang M, Zhang XL, Zhang SJ, Gao



YS, Chen L, Wu MY, Zhou L, Zhou YM, Wang Y, Zheng FJ, Li YH. Regulatory effect of a Chinese herbal medicine formula on non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. World J Gastroenterol 2019; 25(34): 5105-5119. Copyright ©The Author(s) 2019. Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc[6]". And please cite the reference source in the references list.

Response: All our figures were original. We followed your suggestions.

=====



**ROUND 2**

**June 10, 2022**

**Dear editor**

**Editor-in-Chief**

**Hope this finds you well**

**Re: Revised Manuscript Submission** (Manuscript No: 75217) (second-round review)

We would like to thank you and all reviewers for your time and insightful and qualified comments after reviewing our manuscript titled “**Mapping the landscape and structure of global research on binge eating disorder: Visualization and bibliometric analysis**”.

We wish to thank the editor and reviewers again for their time in commenting on the draft manuscript, which we believe has strengthened the paper. We carefully addressed all comments of the reviewers. A point-by--by-point reply to the comments is given below. We hope that we appropriately address all comments.

We look forward to you and reviewers’ comments on the manuscript and hope that the manuscript is given favorable consideration for publication in World Journal of Psychiatry.

Yours sincerely

Sa’ed H Zyoud

[Editor comments](#)

**1. Please sign online copyright**

**Response: we signed it**

**2. There are some specific comments to be modified in the second-round review. Please revise the manuscript according to its comments and make a point-to-point response to the review comments. Note that it is not my opinion, but the reviewer's opinion. Please see the attachment for the reviewer's opinion(75217\_RevisionReviewReport).**

Response: We carefully addressed all comments of the reviewers. A point-by--by-point reply to the comments is given below. We hope that we appropriately address all comments.

3. The content of the Core Tip part is too long, and the number of words should be controlled between 50-100 words. Please modify.

Response: we modified it

4. In the Search Strategies section on page 6, you need to add keywords for which database to search, such as PubMed, and the database must include Reference Citation Analysis.

Response: we added it and also, we included the RCA.

Reviewer reports:

**Reviewer's code:** 05849395

Response: I would like to thank you for the thorough reading of the manuscript and thank you for the encouraging comments and constructive recommendations, which help improve this manuscript's quality.

### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

- a. Paragraphs 9-11 of the Discussion section have not been revised in response to the review comments.

Response: we modified the discussion as you suggested

- b. The second "The fourth most cited article ....." in the discussion section, paragraph 9; it should be "The fifth most cited article ....."

Response: we corrected it

- c. " Since the authors of the 10 most cited articles and the journals that published them are listed in Table 5, it is sufficient to summarize and simplify only the research topics of these 10 articles in the text.

Response: we simplified them



- d. The reference codes following the author column in Table 5 do not match the numbers in the right superscript in the corresponding paragraphs of the text; please read through the entire text and correct them.

**Response: we corrected them**