Specific Comments to Authors: The article is within the scope of the journal, and deals with an interesting topic. It is well-written and well-organized. The reading is fluent. However, there are some aspects that need to be improved:

1) A section on the state of the art must be included.
   Ans: Thank you for pointing this out.
2) The materials and methods should be better explained.
   Ans: The materials and methods is better explained now. Thank you for pointing this out.
3) The proposed experiment is not clear. 3) It should be explained better why the result obtained justifies the conclusions reached.
   Ans: More work has been done on this, it is better explained now.
4) The discussion should be improved, comparing the work presented with other similar works and showing the progress and limitations of the work.
   Ans: The discussion is better improved now.
5) The conclusions should summarize the scientific contribution of the work.
   Ans: This has also been adjusted.

Reviewer #2:
Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)
Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)
Conclusion: Rejection
Specific Comments to Authors:
1. This manuscript should be a letter to the editor or a comment instead of a research paper. If you search the term K-index in PubMed, you will find that there are only 13 papers, meaning that this topic was not quite interesting for the scientific community. Moreover, the authors used only a Twitter platform to evaluate the popularity of gastroenterologists, but there are so many social media platforms that the authors did not mention, such as Facebook, Youtube, TikTok, etc. Hence, the popularity of gastroenterologists only on a Twitter platform could not represent total popularity. The English grammar needed to be substantially polished. The citation pattern is not correct. The references were not in journal format.
   Ans: Thank you for your comments. Despite few studies on K-index, we found it quite an interesting and unique way to evaluate the social media presence and scientific contributions of scientists. Though not scientifically proven to evaluate a physician’s worth, it gives an idea of the activity level of GI physicians on Twitter and even more when they realize their Kardashian index, it creates room for improvement in terms of more research and publications. We used Twitter as
our study population because Khan started his analysis with Twitter and moreover, you can hardly see physicians posting about recently published articles on Instagram, youtube, Facebook, or snap chat. We consider Linked in social media the next in line after Twitter in terms of dissemination of medical information. However, Twitter has over 300 million monthly users with about >385000 scholars.

Reviewer #3:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)
Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)
Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors:
This a study carried out to test the following hypothesis "...many high-impact gastroenterologists don't have a significant social media presence, which limits their outreach and popularity among the public despite significant scholarly work". I have the following comments and questions:

1. Title: Is the question used in the title misleading?
   Ans: When we chose a title, we were looking at what will portray our findings and message to the public which is that most gastroenterologists on Twitter who are active have a Kardashian index between 0-2 portraying them as physician-scientists while those with a score of >5 (meaning more number of followers with fewer citations) are portrayed as physician celebrities.

2. Abstract: The Background section is not a very accurate summary based on what is described in the Introduction. There is a typo in the Results section
   Ans: Thank you for pointing this out. It has been modified and explained better.

3. Introduction: Has the K index been validated somehow as a good metric for "celebrity status"? If yes, please cite. If not, it would be good to mention it.
   Ans: No the K-index has not been validated a good metric for celebrity status.

4. Materials and Methods: Why were only practicing gastroenterologists affiliated with the Top 100 hospitals included? Is this a biased group?
   Ans: The U.S. News rankings are widely recognized and respected in healthcare as a measure of hospital quality. We aimed to establish a benchmark for comparison and evaluation by utilizing the data from these rankings. This allowed us to assess the performance of the doctors from the top-ranked hospitals. We aimed to highlight the expertise and proficiency of these healthcare professionals. As our research is based on their scholarly work, this choice of data provided an opportunity to explore how doctors
affiliated with highly regarded institutions contribute to the field and influence patient outcomes in academic research. By incorporating data from these rankings, we aimed to make the manuscript more accessible and relevant to a wider audience including healthcare professionals, policymakers, and the public. This approach increases the potential impact of our research findings and facilitates the dissemination of valuable information about top-performing doctors and hospitals. Maybe in the future, a bigger study can be done whereby hospitals will be chosen randomly all over the world but there may be problems with where to get all the information pertaining to a physician as US world news would have provided.

5. How was scientific contribution defined? Is the number of citations by itself an accurate metric of scientific contribution?

In our paper, 'scientific contribution' is defined as the cumulative result of three key metrics:

1. The number of publications by the author: This represents the productivity of the researcher and the quantity of their contributions to the field.

2. The number of citations that these publications receive: A high citation count generally indicates that the work has had a significant influence on subsequent research.

3. The h-index of the author: The h-index combines productivity and citation impact into a single metric. An h-index of 'h' signifies that the author has 'h' papers, each of which has been cited at least 'h' times.

We have used databases like Google Scholar, Scopus, and Semantic Scholar to comprehensively assess these metrics across different platforms.

Regarding your second question, we acknowledge that while the number of publications, citations, and h-index are widely accepted indicators of a researcher's impact and productivity, they may not provide a complete picture of scientific contribution. These measures can be influenced by a variety of factors such as length of career, field-specific citation practices, self-citations, and other variables that may not necessarily reflect the quality, novelty, or societal importance of a researcher's work.
We understand these limitations and have tried to consider them in our interpretation of the data. Our aim in this study was not to create a definitive ranking or scoring system but rather to use these metrics as part of a broader discussion about contribution and impact in gastroenterology.

6. Results: It would be good to provide a deeper analysis of the followership of those gastroenterologists with a higher K index. "What is the minimum number of followers that a gastroenterologist on Twitter needs to be considered 'popular'? Which were the hospitals with more high K index gastroenterologists? Was there any correlation between K index and the Top 100 hospitals ranking?

Ans: Thank you so much for pointing this out. We are considering that in the future, those GI physicians with higher K-Index will have to deeper analysis of their followers done to be able to determine how many medical professionals are among them. We were not able to determine the hospitals with higher K-index gastroenterologists, our focus was to give a general overview of GI physician’s activity level on social media and scientific contributions based on scholarly cited works.

7. Discussion: Why didn't the authors start this section with "Few gastroenterologists..."?

Ans: Thank you for pointing this out. A correction has been made.

8. I would suggest to further discuss how the number of followers impact on the quality of the followership (Côté et al. Scientists on Twitter: Preaching to the choir or singing from the rooftops? https://doi.org/10.1139/facets-2018-0002) and how tweeting a paper improves citations (Luc et al. Does Tweeting Improve Citations? One-Year Results From the TSSMN Prospective Randomized Trial 10.1016/j.athoracsur.2020.04.065.

Ans: Thank you for this suggestion. We have further discussed how more followers and being active on Twitter can help improve the number of citations.