

## Peer Review Report

# Review Report on A bibliometric study on global snakebite research indexed in Web of Science

Review, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Rosamund F Lewis

Submitted on: 13 Aug 2023

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2023.1606311

### EVALUATION

#### **Q 1** Please summarize the main theme of the review.

This article summarizes and analyzes the scientific literature on snakebite.

#### **Q 2** Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

This paper is clearly presented and well written. The purpose of undertaking the work could be more clearly articulated up front. While 'what was done' is clearly presented, and the public health rationale for doing provided, the link between the two is weak. For example, regarding the purpose or contribution to the field, identifying research gaps and informing the future research agenda would seem important. Rather than predicting that future hotspots will arise, which seems arbitrary, it would be more helpful to indicate important current research gaps based on this analysis and suggest how the researchers will take the next steps to generate interest in these gaps.

#### **Q 3** Please provide your detailed review report to the authors, structured in major and minor comments.

##### Abstract

The ultimate purpose of the paper is stated as being to 'provide a reference for the future development of snakebite research. Briefly state how this will contribute to broader public health goals in general.

##### Introduction /discussion

The introduction clears sets out the purpose of the study and how it fits into the global health agenda. It would be good to tie the discussion back to the goals set out in the introduction.

##### Materials and methods

Provide a glossary or clear definitions to help the general reader understand more specific terms e.g. 'betweenness centrality analysis' and 'burstiness', terms with which most general readers may not be familiar.

where specific concepts are mentioned in the discussion, such as quality or impact of the literature, explain in methods how these are assessed.

Figure 7, spelling of neglected

##### Discussion

Articulate early in the discussion how this type of bibliometric study can support the response to the public health issue at hand. The paper states 'the impact of the literature on snakebite... is relatively low; therefore, there is room for further expansion of snakebite research, in line with the purpose of this study'. Clarify what would be the expected impact of the literature on the public health challenge, how this quality and impact are measured, and how this work can help achieve the goal.

The numbered sections in the discussion look like sub-titles yet the text is not repeated. To avoid missing key points, provide an introductory sentence at the beginning of the discussion to indicate the numbered discussions are conclusions drawn from the study.

Likewise it would be helpful to articulate how such studies are to be used, for example how they contribute to the completeness and quality of a systematic review, and their broader contribution to public health in general. Is this part of a series of methods papers or standalone?

line 201 – delete the words 'and cultural level' or explain what they mean.

line 202 – the concept of literature quality is introduced here – either provide introduction and results earlier or delete, as it is not clear how this conclusion is arrived at.

line 204 – replace corporation with cooperation

#### PLEASE COMMENT

**Q 4** Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

limitations on completeness are discussed in the paper.

**Q 5** Does this manuscript refer only to published data? (unpublished data is not allowed for Reviews)

Yes.

**Q 6** Does the manuscript cover the issue in an objective and analytical manner

Yes.

**Q 7** Was a review on the issue published in the past 12 months?

No.

**Q 8** Does the review have international or global implications?

yes

**Q 9** Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

yes

**Q 10** Are the keywords appropriate?

yes

**Q 11** Is the English language of sufficient quality?

yes

**Q 12** ➤ Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

#### QUALITY ASSESSMENT

**Q 13** ➤ Quality of generalization and summary

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

**Q 14** ➤ Significance to the field

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

**Q 15** ➤ Interest to a general audience

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

**Q 16** ➤ Quality of the writing

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

#### REVISION LEVEL

**Q 17** ➤ Please take a decision based on your comments:

Minor revisions.