

Peer Review File

Article information: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/atm-20-3700>

Reviewer A:

Comment 1: The manuscript needs extensive revision for language and grammar.

Response: We sincerely appreciate the reviewer's comments. We have polished this manuscript by AJE.

Comment 2: The inclusion criteria used are not mentioned clearly. The keywords used for publication search are missing.

Response: We are sorry about the unclear inclusion criteria. We have added the keywords used for publication search in the second paragraph of 2.1 Data sources and search strategies.

Comment 3: Methods section says "Publications with normal peer-review were enrolled, while others were not included in this analysis." This does not convey useful information.

Response: Sorry for the unnecessary sentence. We deleted this sentence.

Comment 4: The authors have not commented upon the different incidence of UM in various countries and their impact on results of this study. That remains an important factor to consider while looking at countries with large number of publications. The research trend would be a reflection of burden of UM in that particular country. The authors selectively discuss contribution from USA and China elaborately, however, leave out other countries with sizable publications.

Response: We sincerely appreciate the reviewer's comments. We have added the discussion of incidence in countries with a large number of publications, and added discussions on European countries such as Germany and the Netherlands.

Reviewer B:

Comment 1: Line number is recommended in order to put forward opinions about revision.

Response: We sincerely appreciate your comments. We have added line number.

Comment 2: Some editing for English language is required throughout the manuscript due to too many mistakes.

Response: Sorry for the English language mistakes. We have polished this manuscript by AJE.

Comment 3: The innovations of this manuscript are limited. Most of the results have already been described in some review papers.

Response: Thank you for your comments. Although part of the results came from the summary of existing reviews, our conclusions were based on a systematic summary of bibliometrics and gave a reasonable explanation of the reasons for the differences in the contributions of each country or region in this field. At the same time, we have made reasonable predictions for potential research hotspots in uveal melanoma in the future, which has certain guiding significance for the research direction of this field.

Comment 4: Three corresponding authors are not necessary in the manuscript.

Response: We only kept one corresponding author in the revised version.

Comment 5: Most of the tables were listed as “Top ten.....” and they are all insignificant.

Response: Quantity is the most direct reflection method of research contribution, and it is also the statistical method chosen by many existing bibliometric studies (1,2). So, we chose to list the “Top ten” tables to visually display the contributions of researchers

or institutions to uveal melanoma.

Comment 6: The search terms are not described clearly, the Mesh words, searched in title or theme? In WOS database or core database?

Response: The keywords were searched in core database. We have added the search terms in the second paragraph of 2.1 Data sources and search strategies.

Comment 7: Some review articles should not be included in the Bibliometric Analysis.

Response: We have carefully selected UM related research. Reviews are usually written by researchers who have a certain research foundation in the field. The publication of review articles can also represent the research contributions of researchers or institutions to a certain extent, so we choose to include the publication of review papers in statistics.

Comment 8: The results section should be analyzed as follows: Co-authorship, Co-occurrence, Citation, Bibliographic coupling, Co-citation and themes. “Links attribute” and “Total link strength attribute” should be clearly described.

Response: We sincerely appreciate your comments. We added the Co-authorship analysis in the second paragraph of 3.1 Countries’ contributions to global publications and added Co-occurrence analysis and the second paragraph of 3.6 Authors publishing research on UM.

Comment 9: The reference does not meet the format requirements of AME journals.

Response: We have changed into the correct reference style.

Comment 10: Indeed, this manuscript is totally not a Bibliometric Analysis, it is just a percentage analysis.

Response: Percentage statistics can intuitively reflect the contribution of researchers, institutions or regions in the field. It is also helpful to analyze research hotspots and make reasonable predictions of future research trends. Some published bibliometric

studies in other fields have adopted similar statistical methods (1-3). So, we chose a statistical method based on quantity and percentage for bibliometric analysis