Dear editor,

Greetings and happy new year

Thanks a lot for the input and comments on the manuscript

Below is a point by point response to the questions and comments raised my response is bolded

Reviewer reports:

Reviewer #1: This is a very good article which is very timely and can provide a very useful contribution. It is generally written very well, but there are a few things that need to be addressed before it is complete. These are:

1. The first aspect has to do with the terms used in the title and throughout the article. The article is entitled "Global health research in natural disaster." My understanding from reading the article is that is would be better titled "Analysis of health in natural disasters." The reasons for this are a few. First, the term "global" is used throughout the article in terms of "worldwide." The phrase "global health" has in recent years come to have a very specific meaning and is a growing field of research and practice. It does not seem to be what this article is examining. I think this is clear in the article itself where on page 4 the author uses the phrases "global research", "global health research," and "global field" in ways that seem interchangeable, but they all mean different things. In order that the article not be confused with one about "global health" I think this should be removed from the title and throughout the article (unless the author is referring to global health). The second aspect of this is that "research" in the title seems out of place. The search terms do not include research and instead, the authors is focused on finding articles about health in disasters. Maybe the author assumes that all the literature in Scopus is research-based, but this
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does not seem to be the case even from his own findings, where letters, etc. were included in the findings (p. 8). The conclusion also seems to affirm this since the focus is not on research (p. 16). These articles could include ones on clinical practice, humanitarian work, etc., and so this does not seem to actually be a review of research. If I am mistaken in this, the author needs to make it clear how research is a key search term and that his findings are only related to research.

Response: The title has been changed according to the argument made by the reviewer and the term “global health” has been deleted all through the manuscript except in few positions

2. The second general aspect has to do with the Methods. The paragraph on p. 5 distinguishes between systematic reviews, scoping reviews and bibliometric analysis. Some references to key literature on these methods are needed. Also, the author states that systematic reviews are analysed by meta-analysis, but this is not always the case (see the Cochrane Handbook, for example). Sometimes a systematic review can lead to a meta-analysis, but sometimes this is inappropriate. This needs to be corrected in the text.

Response: Please see lines 94 - 99

Secondly, the search strategy does not make it clear whether all the disaster-related terms were examined with an AND to the health terms, or whether this used an OR. This needs to be made explicit.

In the additional file, the final step was the exclusion step of non-health subject areas such as chemistry, physics, geology, and others. After the exclusion of all non-health subjects, we were left with health related subjects such as medicine, psychology, microbiology, and others. The health-related documented were filtered for false – positive documents that were excluded. Public health is part of the subject area medicine.

Thirdly, the reasons for having the Exclusion step (p. 6) need to be provided. It's not clear why this was done, or why it was justified.
Response: Please see line 124

Finally, I wonder why "public health" was not a search term in the health words. This is such a key aspect of this area that I think it should be included (or its omission explained).

Response: Public health was within the “medicine” subject area. It is included.

3. While the article is generally well written, it still has a lot of typos. These are mostly in areas such as mixing plural and singular nouns, incorrectly mixing definite and indefinite articles, and mistakes in the prepositions used. These are detailed issues, but many of these occur in the article. It would be a shame to have such a good piece of research left with these mistakes. One other term to be changed is where the author says Scopus is "the largest database known today" (p. 15). I question if this is the case, and wonder if the author meant largest database of peer-reviewed journals.

Response: Language and grammar corrections were carried out all through the manuscript

Reviewer #2: The search strategy is not clear to me. (additional file 1, line 130). did you combine the first 6 sections with "OR", and then apply the "AND NOT"? or was the "AND NOT" applied only to the last? the first section in particular, seems to be a strange mix of title AND title-abs AND scrtile AND title-abs. The * is not applied consistently throughout the strategy, nor ".". scrtile terms are not consistent either (why not include emergency in the first block?)

Response: Yes, I combined the first five queries followed by and “AND NOT” function. This created a database of health literature in natural disaster. An exclusion step was made to remove false-positive documents from the database of health literature in natural disasters.

Scopus search engine allows for a mix of functions such as Title, Title-abs, etc

The first block included emergenc* as a keyword.
The fundamental bias Scopus towards English language, and Western/Northern countries research outputs is an important one that is only touched on briefly (line 317, line 342) I think a lot of the findings of this paper reflect this bias, and while it is an acknowledged limitation, one that can't be ignored.

Response: please see line 327

Annual growth of publications. Does the growth in number of publications (line 188 onwards) reflect the general trend towards increasing publications, regardless of topic? Yes there was a noticeable after 2004, but so was there for virtually all subject areas.

Response: It is true that there is a positive growth of publications in all sciences with time. The difference is the steepness of the growth line.

Most frequent author keywords. (line 202 onwards) Isn't this a self-fulfilling prophesy? The nature of the search strategy will automatically dictate the range of keywords used by the authors. So what was the point of this analysis? The same with journal names - if you include a specific list of keywords you require to find as srctitles as part of your search strategy, you may miss some relevant journals.

Response: The purpose of these maps was to show themes or clusters of keywords and how they were distributed

An unmentioned limitation of the study is that citation count is just a number - a paper could receive many citations because it is poor research, as well as if it is good research. That is the benefit of a systematic review over a bibliographic analysis - that the quality of the work is taken into account, not just that it exists.

Response: see line 332

However, the conclusion that more collaboration is required and a broader range of research into all aspects of disaster health is one I agree with.
typos/grammer:

line 262 - "A third major natural disaster the" should be "A third major natural disaster that"

line 275 - "health system" should be "health systems"

line 291/292 - is this correct: "Philippines (28 publications) and Indonesia (51 publications) ranked 25th and 36th position respectively". How can the Philippines with fewer publications rank higher than Indonesia?

line 293 - scholar should be scholars

line 297 - publication should be publications

line 299 - citation should be citations

line 306 - "regional nature rather than global one" should be "a regional nature rather than a global."

Response: All typos were corrected