This manuscript investigated different avenues for comparing and contrasting research between and within countries in the field of psychiatry. The authors reviewed 51,072 articles published in 50 Web of Science journals between 2004 and 2009 inclusive. Rank ordering indicated that the USA has the greatest number of articles, total citations, and citations per article, whereas the rank order of the remaining nine most productive countries differed significantly based on which metric was used. No differences were found in self-citation practices between the US and Europe. The authors provided several potential implications based on these findings (e.g., that funding allocations may vary depending on which metric is used). Below I will provide recommendations that I hope the authors will find helpful in considering and improving their work.

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

The authors are to be commended for thorough selection of psychiatric journals, resulting in a broad snapshot of international publication standings in psychiatry. That said, several choices the authors made with regards to analyzing the data further are confusing and potentially biased.

1. It is unclear why the authors chose to analyze the entire European continent together, but did not include Canada in with the American analyses.

2. Further to that point, it is unclear why the additional analyses only included American and European articles when Canada performed better than the UK in the citations/paper metric. The authors are careful throughout the article not to state a preference for any one type of metric, but given that only American and European analyses are conducted the implication is that total global citation score and number of records is better.

3. The authors never discuss whether potential biases may have influenced the 1000-paper sampling technique. Again, the exclusion of other countries (Canada, Australia) from is curious given the higher publication count than Europe excluding Germany/UK.

4. The countries represented in this paper are predominantly Western. With the exception of one comment on language (p. 11, line 264), the authors do not discuss this in any great detail. As a reader, I found it particularly surprising that China was not represented in any way if for no other reason than sheer population size. In order to be less Western-centric, discussion of this omission and any potential others is needed.
5. A number of other metrics exist for evaluating research merit – including the h-index (as in Carleton, Parkerson, & Horswill, 2012), which deals with publication quality and accounts for such issues as self-citation. I recognize the authors considered institutions in general rather than particular individuals at these institutions; however, I saw no discussion of the flaws in the metrics they did use or consideration of additional metrics that could be used.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. The manuscript should be thoroughly reviewed for grammar and punctuation. For example, the commas need to be revised on p. 2, lines 50-53. There are several instances of these types of errors throughout.

2. Rationale should be provided for why the dates were restricted to 2004-2009 (p. 5, line 118).

3. The authors state on p. 5, lines 125-126 that Web of Science was chosen due to its capability for “citation analysis,” but then state on lines 130-131 that citation analysis was not yet available.

4. Page 6, lines 160-161: one of the stated goals of the manuscript was to generate the top ten institutes in psychiatry in terms of publication productivity. However, in practice, the authors generated the top ten American and top ten European institutions (excluding Canadian, Australian, etc. Institutions) and did not finalize this list. Either the stated goal or the displayed results need modifying.

5. Page 10, lines 225-227: did the authors intend to generate the number of collaborations in the 1,000 sampled papers, rather than the number of collaborations cited by these papers? The former would be useful information as well. Do those who collaborate internationally tend to cite other international collaborations?

6. The first paragraph in the Discussion (lines 240-247) introduce several new citations that should have been present in the introduction.

7. Page 13, line 297: the APA 6th edition manual indicates that gender neutral terminology is required in scientific publications. As such, revision of “his scientific network” is required.
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Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
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