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Reviewer's report:

This study focuses on an important issue of bibliometric visibility of a small multidisciplinary field and potential changes of this visibility induced by new bibliometric indices and databases.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Page 6, section C. Indices rating papers: Explain why you have not used the total number of received citations as a measure to evaluate papers.

2. Page 6, objectives: Help your readers to understand why you chose Medical Informatics as your medical discipline to study the effects of the new indices on the visibility of research output.

3. Page 12 and table 3: Clarify how similar Schumie and MeSH-Med journal groups are when the observed value of the similarity measure is 0.20.

4. Page 16, paragraph 2: Explain what are the different perspectives in the sentence “Thus, we favor the view ...”. Help your reader to understand the main differences between the two MI related journal groups.

5. Figure 5. How is it possible that the Hirsch index value of an author is greater than the number of papers published by the author? For example in this scatter plot one author has less than 20 papers but the Hirsch index is close to 120. Explain what is “productivity based ranking”. If the measures are rankings instead of absolute original values this should be clarified. Also the number of authors (sample size of this scatter plot) should be reported. The figure legend and axes labels need clarification.

Minor Essential Revisions

6. Abstract, Methods section: Consider replacing “effect” with “relationship” or “dependence”. The correlation coefficient measures relationship between these indices, not their effect to the visibility of authors.

7. Page 5, paragraph 3: Correct the typo “(Np <= h)”. Consider replacing “an HI of h” with “Hirsch index (HI) h”.

8. Page 13 and Figure 3: Consider adding the absolute average scores of the journal-related measures.
9. Page 24, Appendix 6: Clarify what are the numbers in the parenthesis, e.g. (25±15.5).

10. Page 15, paragraph 1: Consider removing the last sentence “The (1-2a) confidence interval ...”. It is redundant and adds nothing to previous sentence.

11. Page 24, Appendix 4: Is the statement “The ISI Web of Science does not provide HI data for authors” valid? This reviewer has access to the Web of Science database where the output includes citation report with h-index.

12. Table 11. Consider adding explanations for the index abbreviations. They are described in the literature review section but the reader should be able to understand this table without taking a peep at the text.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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