May 4, 2022

Dear editor

Editor-in-Chief

 Hope this finds you well

Re: Revised Manuscript Submission (Manuscript No: 76146)

We would like to thank you and all reviewers for your time and insightful and qualified comments after reviewing our manuscript titled "**Mapping the Global Research Landscape on Insulin Resistance: 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 Diabetes.

Yours sincerely

Sa'ed H Zyoud

Reviewer reports:

Reviewer #1

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

The manuscript provided an overview of insulin resistance, as well as meta and bibliometric analysis. It is well written, with only a few minor grammatical errors. The title, abstract, and final conclusion are all descriptive and well-written. With good efforts, the figures are clear. I can not direct any criticism to this manuscript.

Response: Thank you for this nice comments and encouragements.

Reviewer #2

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

This is an interesting bibliometric analysis study aiming to Mapping the Global Research Landscape in the field of insulin resistance research.

> 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.

However some further amendments are necessary.

1. It would be useful to add two additional columns in the Table one with the Journal's name and a second with the type of the article.

   Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We added it as you suggested (Table 5)

2. It would be useful the authors to comment if the top-cited articles were published in the highest impact factor journals.

   Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We added it as you suggested (Table 5) and discussed it in the discussion.

3. It would be better to obtain more researches from more database, not only in the Scopus database.

   Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We explained why we relied on only Scopus as you suggested. We added this information to Methods and Materials "Unfortunately, only one database may be utilized in bibliometric analyses because data from many databases cannot be integrated and analyzed. On the other hand, systematic reviews use multiple databases to retrieve a large number of documents for further analysis [16]. Furthermore, only one database was chosen on the topic's and objective's coverage and past research show that Web of Science and PubMed are included in the Scopus. Based on previous studies and findings, it was recommended to use Scopus (Elsevier database) because it was the most comprehensive database on the subject, offering all the data needed for quantitative analysis [17, 18]."

Reviewer #3

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Based on the Scopus database, the authors mapped the global research landscape on insulin resistance using bibliometric methodology. They sorted out the development process of this field, analyzed the hot changes of research topics, and visualized the analysis results. This approach might assist researchers in choosing new research areas and recognizing research hot spots and frontiers. The manuscript has a clear and distinct structure.

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.

However, there are a few concerns that the authors should address.

1. It is suggested to add papers from other databases besides Scopus database.

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We explained why we relied on only Scopus as you suggested. We added this information to Methods and Materials "Unfortunately, only one database may be utilized in bibliometric analyses because data from many databases cannot be integrated and analyzed. On the other hand, systematic reviews use multiple databases to retrieve a large number of documents for further analysis [16]. Furthermore, only one database was chosen on the topic's and objective's coverage and past research show that Web of Science and PubMed are included in the Scopus. Based on previous studies and findings, it was recommended to use Scopus (Elsevier database) because it was the most comprehensive database on the subject, offering all the data needed for quantitative analysis [17, 18]."

2. It is suggested to supplement the authors or scientific research teams who have published the top number papers in this field to facilitae other researchers to follow their studies.

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We added it as you suggested (Table 6)

3. 10-30 top literatures including detail information should be recommended based on the number of citations, publication magazine, H-index, et al. Thus, the manuscript may provide more information resources for relevant scientific researchers.

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We added it as you suggested (Table 5)

Reviwer #4

1. Please, state clearly the reason to write this manuscript. How exactly presented results could facilitate research in the area of diabetes?

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We added it as you suggested (Introduction)

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 Diabetes, 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 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, results, and Table 5).

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