

Dear Reviewer,

Thank you for your thorough review of our study and for your valuable comments. We appreciate the concerns you've raised regarding certain limitations, and we are eager to clarify and expand on these points. Below are our specific responses to each issue mentioned:

**Limitations of Database Selection:** We acknowledge that our exclusive use of the Web of Science Core Collection (WoSCC) may limit the scope of our analysis. We recognize the importance of incorporating other databases, such as PubMed and Scopus, as well as literature in different languages, to achieve a more comprehensive understanding of research dynamics in this field. We will suggest that future research consider utilizing multiple databases to mitigate selection bias and achieve a more comprehensive understanding of the research dynamics in this field.

**Limitations of the Time Frame:** We agree that the coverage from 2013 to 2023 may not fully represent the latest findings due to publication and citation lag. We will consider this lag in our interpretations and emphasize the need for more timely tracking in this rapidly evolving area. We will suggest that future studies implement more timely tracking of updates in this rapidly evolving area.

**Subjectivity of Results:** To address concerns regarding subjectivity in our bibliometric analysis using VOSviewer and CiteSpace, we will clarify our methodology and the rationale behind our interpretations. We aim to

enhance transparency and credibility in our research. We will detail the specific steps taken during our analysis to minimize subjective influence, thereby enhancing the transparency and credibility of our research.

**Complexity of Clinical Practice and Individual Differences:** We recognize that bibliometric analysis may not capture the complexities of clinical practice. We will emphasize the need to integrate clinical data with bibliometric analysis to better understand how individual differences affect research outcomes and the relevance of our findings to clinical applications.

Additionally, we would like to highlight the innovative aspects and significance of our work. This study provides a comprehensive bibliometric analysis of the relationship between gut microbiota and nonalcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD), revealing emerging trends and key research hotspots. Our findings enhance the understanding of NAFLD's pathogenesis and open new avenues for treatment, making a valuable contribution to both the scientific community and clinical practice.

We sincerely hope these clarifications meet your expectations. Thank you once again for your critical insights. We look forward to your further guidance and suggestions.

## Round 2

Dear reviewer,

Thank you for taking the time to review our manuscript and providing valuable comments. We greatly appreciate your suggestions, and we have carefully discussed and revised each of them.

We understand the importance of citations in enhancing paper quality and supporting research arguments. However, upon meticulous examination of the literature you specified (10.1007/s11694-024-02697-2), we have found that it is not directly pertinent to the subject matter and research content of our article. The primary focus of this study was to elucidate the potential efficacy of ginger extract in ameliorating NAFLD; Nevertheless, no mention has been made regarding whether ginger exerts its beneficial effects on NAFLD through modulation of gut microbiota. Furthermore, one of the articles about the intestinal microbiome (10.1016/j.jbiomac.2024.136744) investigating red yeast rice (RYR) revealed the presence of a novel polysaccharide PRY1-1, which demonstrated potential in improving liver lipid metabolism induced by high-fat diet (HFD) through regulation of blood lipids and other mechanisms. Additionally, PRY1-1 may also confer protection on intestinal health via modulation of intestinal flora and other mechanisms; However, the specific interrelationship between these two aspects remains unaddressed. Hence, integrating it into our paper while maintaining logical coherence and content focus would be challenging. We kindly request that you reconsider this recommendation while understanding our commitment to maintaining a focused approach and ensuring high-quality content in line with the topic's scope.

Regarding your suggestions on another recent paper on the intestinal microbiome (10.1016/j.jbiomac.2023.128588), we have thoroughly read this article's full text and believe it is relevant to our research topic. Therefore, it has been cited in the discussion part of the paper and marked in yellow.

We acknowledge the significance of academic communication as well as the value of reviewer suggestions; thus, we have cited extensively from closely related literature that supports our argumentation throughout this manuscript. These references encompass representative domestic and international research findings while ensuring timeliness and reliability.

Thank you for your review and suggestions once again.

Sincerely,

Cai-Yun,Huang

Dear Reviewer,

Thank you very much for your meticulous review of our manuscript and for your constructive comments. We highly appreciate your time and effort in providing valuable feedback to enhance our work.

In response to your concern about the number of figures and tables in our manuscript, we have carefully re-evaluated each graphic's necessity and contribution to the paper. Specifically, we find that Figures 3A and 3B, which both present the "Distribution of countries/regions in terms of article publication," convey the same information and thus, do indeed exhibit redundancy. To avoid repetition and streamline our presentation, we have decided to remove Figure 3B entirely from the manuscript. Additionally, we have deleted the sentence "each, while Figure 3B shows that seventeen countries/regions exceed the threshold of twenty published articles" from the results section to maintain consistency and clarity. Concurrently, we have renamed Figure 3A as Figure 3 to reflect this change and ensure coherence throughout the text. We believe that this revision will enhance the readability and impact of our manuscript without compromising the key messages we aim to convey.

Regarding the remaining figures and tables, we stand firm in our belief that they are indispensable for fully elucidating the themes and findings of our

study. Each graphic has been carefully selected to provide crucial data, insights, and evidence that support our methodology, results, and conclusions. They serve to clarify complex concepts, demonstrate trends, and facilitate a deeper understanding of our research findings. We have ensured that each retained figure and table is concise, well-labeled, and accompanied by clear captions that explain their relevance and significance within the context of our study. We are confident that keeping these graphics within the main text will greatly benefit the overall coherence and impact of our manuscript.

We are grateful for your guidance and open to any further suggestions you might have regarding the presentation of our data and findings. We are committed to refining our manuscript to meet the journal's standards and to ensure it appeals to its intended audience.

Thank you once again for your valuable input. We look forward to your continued consideration and are hopeful for a positive outcome.

Best regards,

Cai-Yun,Huang