Peer-review report(s). Authors must resolve all issues in the manuscript that are raised in the peer-review report(s) and provide point-by-point responses to each of the issues raised in the peer-review report(s):

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors:

1. In the abstract in their conclusion the authors state that “The identified pathogenic mechanisms and potential therapeutic targets serve as the foundation for translating findings from basic research to clinical applications.” Is this conclusion part of the research they conducted?

Reply: It is not a direct result of experimental research conducted but rather an interpretation of the body of literature analyzed in our study. We analyzed a large number of publications to identify trends and key findings, which allowed us to draw conclusions about the current state and potential future directions of research on sepsis-associated liver injury. We have revised the Conclusion of the abstract.

2. In order to substantiate the conclusion “our study will provide useful reference for further research on SLI” the authors need to consider analyzing the data on the basis of the experimental system used (patients, animals, immortalized cells etc.) in the research described in the publications included in the study.

Reply: There is no way to follow the experimental system when performing the data, it can only be reflected in the keyword analysis. The keyword analysis of this study already includes the "experimental system" you mentioned, such as CLP mice, TNF-α, NF-κB, etc..

3. Further analysis indicating the number of citations for each keyword could facilitate the identification of the pathways studied extensively to unravel the SLI pathogenic mechanisms and pave the way for the translation of basic research to clinical application.

Reply: Thank you for your suggestion. We apologize for the misunderstanding due to the lack of clarity in our description. table6 (new table 7) shows the number of citations for each keyword, and the keywords with more occurrences are related to the pathogenesis of SLI. We have changed the title of table 6 and the description of the keywords in the results section.

4. Please discuss potential changes in the direction of research reflected on the number of citations in keywords used in early compared to recent years’ publications.

Reply: We added potential changes in research direction to the discussion.

5. Please indicate clearly the inclusion and exclusion criteria used.

Reply: The inclusion of exclusion criteria was included in the original text under "Data sources and search strategy".

“The query terms were shown as follows: topic search = “liver injury” OR “liver damage” OR “hepatic injury” OR “hepatic damage” AND sepsis OR septic. Upon confining the language to English and publication types to reviews and articles, 1314 papers issued from Jan 1, 2000 to Oct 28, 2023 were searched from WoSCC.
The abstracts and titles were independently screened by two reviewers to eliminate literature not pertinent to SLI.

Reviewer #2:

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

**Language Quality:** Grade A (Priority publishing)

**Conclusion:** Accept (General priority)

**Specific Comments to Authors:**

This is an interesting study in which authors aimed to determine most prominent countries, institutions, researchers, journals and the focus of interest areas (key words) in the field of SLI. They found that although most of the research has been done in China, USA has more impact; the papers have been published at journals of basic science and ICU rather than journals of hepatology and most of the citations have been belong to papers investigating pathophysiology or treatment targets of SLI, such as statins, granisetron, TNF-α, NF-κB, NLRP3, LPS, and CLP. My comments are as follow:

* The manuscript must be reviewed by a statistician who is an expert on bibliometric analysis.

Reply: The manuscript has been reviewed by a statistician, and the document has been uploaded as an attachment for review.

* The manuscript should highlight concepts about SLI rather than names of institutions or researches. Furthermore, important data should be given as either table of graphics. Therefore, I suggest the omission of Figure 4, 6, 7 and Table 1, 5, 6.

Reply: We agree with you that the article should emphasize the concept of SLI. However, for the sake of the structural integrity of the article, the information in these graphs and tables should be presented in a manner similar to a baseline table. Therefore, after discussion we are not prepared to remove these graphs.

* The colour labels/code must be added to graphics.

Reply: We have added color labels to all figure legends as you suggested.

**Editorial Office’s comments.** Authors must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office’s comments and suggestions, which are provided below:

1 **Scientific quality:** The authors submitted a study of research trends and hotspots of sepsis-associated liver injury from 2000 to 2023.

1 **Classification:** Grade B, Grade C;

2 **Summary of the Peer-Review Report:** The manuscript should highlight concepts about SLI rather than names of institutions or researches. Furthermore, important data should be given as either table of graphics. The manuscript must be reviewed by a statistician who is an expert on bibliometric analysis. Please discuss potential changes in the direction of research reflected on the number of citations in keywords used in early compared to recent years’ publications. 5. Please indicate clearly the inclusion and
exclusion criteria used;

Reply: The issues you mentioned have been responded to above, point-by-point.

(3) **References recommendations:** The reviewer didn’t request the authors to cite improper references published by him/herself.

Reply: No published literature by the authors was cited in this study.

(4) **Manuscript Type:** After verification, the manuscript type has been changed from "Systematic Reviews" to " Scientometrics"

Reply: We have revised the manuscript type.

2 Specific comments

(1) **Country/Territory of origin:** China.

(2) Please visit the following website for the professional English language editing companies that we recommend: https://www.wjgnet.com/bps/gerinfo/240.

Reply: The language of the article has been polished by a professional English editor, and the document has been uploaded as an attachment for review.

(3) **Manuscript Title:** Words such as ‘exploration’, ‘research’, ‘analysis’, ‘observation’, and ‘investigation’ are to be avoided.

Reply: We have revised the title.

(4) Please add the **Running Title:** A short running title of no more than 6 words should be provided. Abbreviations are permitted. **For example,** Losurdo G et al. Two-year follow-up of HCC.

Reply: We have added the running title.

(5) **Author contributions does not meet the requirements:** The ‘Author contributions’ passage describes the specific contribution(s) made by each author. The author’s names will be listed in the following format: full family (sur)name, followed by abbreviated first and middle names. For example, Bryan L Copple should be revised as Copple BL. A full multi-author example is: Wang CL, Liang L, Fu JF, Zou CC, Hong F and Wu XM designed the research study; Wang CL, Zou CC, Hong F and Wu XM performed the research; Xue JZ and Lu JR contributed new reagents and analytic tools; Wang CL, Liang L and Fu JF analyzed the data and wrote the manuscript; All authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

Reply: We have revised the author contribution as you advised.

(6) **The “Key Words” does not meet the requirements:** The first letter of each keyword will be capitalized, and each keyword will be separated by a semicolon, with no terminal period. **An example of correct formatting is:** Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease; Alcoholic liver disease; Non-alcoholic steatohepatitis; Insulin resistance; Oxidative stress.

Reply: We have revised the Keywords as you advised.

(7) **Figures.** All figures must have a detailed figure legend that provides a clear and comprehensive description of the information presented in the figure, so that the reader can understand without having to refer back to any other portion of the manuscript. Uniform presentation should be used for figures
showing the same or similar contents, for example, “Figure 1 Pathological changes of atrophic gastritis after treatment. A: ...; B: ...; C: ...; D: ...; E: ...; F: ...; G: ...”.

Abbreviations must be defined upon first appearance in the Figure Legends. Do not use non-standard abbreviations, unless they appear at least two times in the text preceding the first usage/definition.

Original figure documents. In the meantime, authors should provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor, and upload it to the file destination of “Image File” in the F6Publishing system.

Reply: We have revised the figure legends and provided image file as requested.

(7) Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy(ies) of any approval document(s).

Reply: The document has been uploaded as an attachment for review.

3 Recommendation: Transfer to other BPG journals (World Journal of Hepatology).

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)
Scientific Quality: Transfer to another BPG Journal