

Peer Review File

Article Information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/apm-21-3420>

Reviewer A

This is a well-written comprehensive review on an interesting topic. The authors have prepared a nice manuscript on the characteristics of the 100 most influential articles on carotid stenosis. I have the following suggestions and comments:

1. The full list of the 100 most influential articles should be provided in a Supplement. Readers may wish to check which are these 100 most influential articles together with the number of citations for each article.

→ Supplementary Table 1 was added.

2. A table should be added providing the category type of the 100 most influential articles, i.e. 10 original studies, 20 systematic reviews and meta-analyses, etc.

→ The article type was divided into the following categories: clinical study, review, basic research, guideline. We analyzed the T100 according to the article type and added the result as a text.

3. Did the authors consider Guidelines on the management of carotid stenosis, e.g. the 2018 ESVS Guidelines?

→ Thank you for the important point.

Added content about ESVS 2018 to introduction.

Naylor AR, Ricco JB, de Borst GJ, et al. Editor's Choice – Management of atherosclerotic carotid and vertebral artery disease: 2017 Clinical Practical Guidelines of the European Society for Vascular Surgery (ESVS). *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg* 2018; 55: 3-81.

4. The Discussion should be expanded to discuss why and how these articles are the most 100 most influential articles? Have they changed the guidelines and decision-making? Have they changed the management of patients?

→ For identifying the most influential articles on carotid stenosis, the citation number of the article was used. The articles obtained from Web of Science were sorted by citation numbers, and articles that had more citations were ranked higher; a method initially developed by Paladugu et al.¹ And then, the 100 articles with the most citations were selected. Although the citation number of the article will be changed as time goes by, it is thought to be important to determine the most influential articles on carotid stenosis in the present day.

¹Paladugu R, Schein M, Gardezi S, Wise L. One hundred citation classics in general

surgical journals. World J Surg. 2002 Sep;26(9):1099-105.

Reviewer B

I think this article has significant potential to highlight the benefits of a bibliometric analysis, but it does not do so. You should consider referencing other such papers and their impact or contribution to their scientific field. Why does this matter? That point is not illustrated clearly enough.

Additionally the background on the current utility and utilization of medical therapy vs. surgical intervention (CAS vs. CEA) is too limited. In the modern era, this discussion should also include TCAR.

- ➔ That's good point. However, bibliometric analysis is a study of the factual value of literature, not field of evaluating its clinical impact. TCAR is a newer technology, and it did not become commonplace when authors designed this study.

Lines 37-38: should there be a citation there?

Line 68: the word "recannalization" is not the best choice. This suggest that the artery was completely occluded and needed to be re-opened rather than treating the stenosis.

- ➔ Changed to "correction of stenosis by CEA or CAS"

Line 70: CT should also be mentioned

- ➔ Added "computed tomography"

Lines 78-79: it is not necessary to list both the reference number and title of the article

Line 80-82: same as above

- ➔ I want to describe the top 100 citation range and mean value. In bibliometric analysis, there is a tendency to indicate the impact information of the article by indicating the citation number.

Line 88-89: the title of this referenced article is not correct and should end at "a case-control study"

- ➔ There was an error. Corrected.

Lines 130-135: I wish you would expand further on the benefits or utility of this type of analysis

Reviewer C

It is an interesting question that the authors intended to investigate. However, i personally feel that the analysis into the trends of research and publication of research articles on CEA and CAS over a period of time does not add much value to the current scientific literature. I would be a lot keener on the trends of CEA and CAS over the course of this period. Although such articles are available there is always a constant need for update in this area due to the exceedingly dynamic nature of this field.

→ As your comment, it is important to investigate the current trend of management for carotid stenosis. Nevertheless, it is meaningful to investigate the most influential articles on carotid stenosis because this work serves as a guide as to what makes a citable paper. For this reason, numerous previous reports have researched the most influential articles on specific medical area.

Based on your opinion, in the future, we plan to investigate the recent 10- or 20-years trend of research on carotid stenosis for analyzing the dynamic change in the management of carotid stenosis.