**Editorial comments**

Changes to be made by the Author(s):  
1. Please take this opportunity to thoroughly proofread the manuscript to ensure that there are no spelling or grammar issues. The JoVE editor will not copy-edit your manuscript and any errors in the submitted revision may be present in the published version.

**Response**: We sent our manuscript to English-literature department, The University of Jordan to review its English Language.

2. Please submit the figures as a vector image file to ensure high resolution throughout production: (.svg, .eps, .ai). If submitting as a .tif or .psd, please ensure that the image is 1920 pixels x 1080 pixels or 300dpi.  
**Response**: We provided a .ai version of the figures.

3. Please ensure that the references appear as the following: [Lastname, F.I., LastName, F.I., LastName, F.I. Article Title. Source. Volume (Issue), FirstPage – LastPage (YEAR).] For more than 6 authors, list only the first author then et al.  
**Response**: We amended the style of the included references as suggested.

4. Please remove the embedded Table from the manuscript. All tables should be uploaded separately to your Editorial Manager account in the form of an .xls or .xlsx file. Each table must be accompanied by a title and a description after the Representative Results of the manuscript text.  
**Response**: We removed the tables from the text and uploaded them separately as a .xlx extension.

5. Please revise the text to avoid the use of any personal pronouns (e.g., "we", "you", "our" etc.).  
**Response**: We amended as suggested.

6. Please ensure that all text in the protocol section is written in the imperative tense as if telling someone how to do the technique (e.g., “Do this,” “Ensure that,” etc.). The actions should be described in the imperative tense in complete sentences wherever possible. Avoid usage of phrases such as “could be,” “should be,” and “would be” throughout the Protocol. Any text that cannot be written in the imperative tense may be added as a “Note.” However, notes should be concise and used sparingly. Please include all safety procedures and use of hoods, etc.  
**Response**: We amended as suggested.

7. Protocol: Please integrate the example with the general instructions instead of having it as two discrete sections.  
**Response**: We integrated the example search with the protocol general instructions.

**Reviewers' comments**

**Reviewer #1**

Major Concerns:  
I do not believe that this topic would be a good inclusion for Jove. Databases frequently change formats, so these specific protocols would be useful for long.

**Response**: We agree with the reviewer on the issue of “frequently changing formats”, which is why we didn’t get into the details of the database layout and format, but the general way of including articles in the databases and the codes used by each database to retrieve search results are fairly constant.

I also found the writing confusing, missing directions in areas, and in strong need of a native English speaker's review.

**Response**: We sent our manuscript to English-literature department, The University of Jordan to review its English Language.  
  
The authors also seemed to imply that the use of databases for bibliometric analysis was new, when in fact it is not at all. I found it troubling that the researchers seemed to be totally unaware of this. While this use of databases may be new to them, this statement demonstrates a lack of awareness of this field, as librarians and other bibliometricians have been using databases (and print indices prior to this) for this type of research for many years. That they seemed to be totally unaware of this made me score them poorly regarding the "sufficient introduction" category.

**Response**: The idea we wanted to deliver from the beginning of introduction is not claiming that the use of databases for bibliometric analysis is “new”, and we explicitly stated that the use of these databases “was recently changed”. By this, we meant that digitalizing literature databases further stimulated and facilitated the ability of researchers to use these databases for bibliometric analysis. We rephrased the beginning of the study by a historic perspective with a further clarifications of what the reviewer pointed at.  
  
  
Minor Concerns:  
It would be quite rare for institutions to be able to afford to subscribe to Web of Science and Scopus since they are both very costly, and there is much overlap between these databases. PubMed however is free. Although I realize that this is not a requirement of this protocol, I think it is worth noting. If you chose to move forward with this protocol, I would recommend splitting these into separate protocols.

**Response**: We agree with the reviewer that Web of Science and Scopus are expensive products and it is difficult for institutions to subscribe to both, although our institution have access for both databases. We explicitly stated the differences in terms of cost and availability in (Table 3), and we further detailed this information in the introduction as the reviewer suggested. We already have a divided section for each database’s protocol.  
  
  
  
**Reviewer #2:**  
Manuscript Summary:  
This manuscript is for a video that instructs country search from three databases: PubMed, Web of Science and Scopus  
  
Major Concerns:  
1.You haven't explained how to download the results from Scopus and Web of Science, only for Pubmed.

**Response**: Both Scopus and Web of Science provide detailed result analysis functions that are not available in PubMed, where in PubMed, researcher needs to download the results and analyze them as explained in the manuscript. Moreover, we stated in the protocol search for Scopus and Web of Science that researcher can download the results in a CSV format.

You also failed to mention that both WoS and Scopus have advanced search options. You can use AFFILCOUNTRY in Scopus to search for publications from the specific country  
In WoS you can use the CU modifier to search for publications from a specific country

**Response**: Thank you for the suggestion. In (Table 2), we detailed the available search options for each database, where functions the reviewer suggested are available. We added to the text that researchers may refer to instructions by each database for details on doing each function (as this may change with time, and it is difficult to summarize them in this protocol).

2. Would be better to present the results in tables or charts, and compare the data from the sources.

**Response**: The idea from the representative results are not the results themselves, but to provide and example on how to execute the protocol, so that separating the the graphs would be more suitable to show the graph produced by each database for each search.

You explain why there are less results from Pubmed, but what is the reason for the differences between WoS and Scopus?

**Response**: The results from PubMed are much lower than those from Scopus and Web of Science, as noted by the reviewer, where an explanation is warranted. But for the difference between Scopus and Web of Science, the difference is small and can be explained by the variability in the criteria adopted by each database to index journals and their publications.

3. Web of Science has data from 1900 and onwards. The start date depends on the subscription your institution has. I, for example, only have access from 1965.  
**Response**: Thank you for the point, we added a notice in (Table 3) that the coverage is based on subscription.

4. Far too many mistakes/typos in English  
**Response**: We sent our manuscript to English-literature department, The University of Jordan to review its English Language.

Minor Concerns:  
1. The section on Web of Science, starts with:  
The first step to access the full search capabilities of Scopus database, you need to register.  
Academic institutions usually registered in Scopus, so check if your institution already registered and have access to the database.  
This is obviously a mistake.

**Response**: Thank you, we corrected this mistake.

2. Not everyone has the proceedings and the book indexes. And one can also exclude databases (like AH or SCIE) from a search.

**Response**: We explained that researchers can choose the database to search in during Web of Science search.  
  
  
  
**Reviewer #3:**  
Manuscript Summary:  
This submission provides guidelines as to how to query different bibliographic databases for the purposes of analysis. The authors use the information to do some basic counts of records where a Jordanian author can be identified. This type of basic analysis is not bibliometrics: it is basic information.  
Response:

Major Concerns:  
--The English needs a good deal of work throughout, including subject/verb agreement, tense, and punctuation.

**Response**: We sent our manuscript to English-literature department, The University of Jordan to review its English Language.

--The definition of "bibliometrics" should be drawn from a more authoritative source such as "The Metrics of Science and Technology" by E. Geisler, or "The Challenge of Scientometrics" by L. Leydesdorff.

Response: The definition we used to define bibliometrics is described to be “serviceable”, and we believe it service the aim of our study. We added another definition, which we believe drawn from an authoritative study in bibliometric definition. We couldn’t access the definitions suggested by the reviewer.

--The fact that two of the databases are privately owned and subscription based should be noted. (Web of Science is owned by Clarivate and Scopus by Elsevier.). The PubMed database is public because it was created and is maintained by the National Institutes of Health Library of Medicine within the government of the United States. This should also be noted.

**Response**: In (Table 3), we detailed the cherecterestics of each database including its free/paid status. We added a row to the table detailing the ownership for each database to further deliver the reviewer’s point of view.

--The additional data that the authors note as being available, such as R&D/GDP measures, are provided by the OECD, I believe, but this should be checked. Clarivate and Elsevier do not collect this information themselves. The additional information can be acquired for free from OECD or World Bank.

**Response**: We clarified that population, GDP, and world region divisions are not supported from the three databases, instead researchers can be obtain them from World Bank, OECD, and WHO (references for each them are provided).

--The Web of Science database does not allow downloading of more than 500 records at a time. This feature means that special steps must be taken to download results with more than 500 records. The authors should provide this information to the reader. (I am not sure what restrictions are placed on Scopus records.)

**Response**: No restrictions are present for Scopus, as the records can be downloaded at one time. For Web of Science, researchers need to download results several times with 5000 records each time (e.g. it would take only 2 times for 10,000 results). We clarified the point in the text.

--Neither the Web of Science nor Scopus claims to represent all of science. These services do not index local publications (that may be published within Jordan for regional scientists) or journals with a highly specialized readership. It appears that they publish no more than 50 percent of the published material. However, they can validate the materials they index - meaning that predatory journals are not included in these services. Readers may wish to know that fact. Both of the major indexing services have expanded their set of journals to include more materials from developing countries. This change in the list of included journals makes it difficult to do a long term comparison because the list of journals will change.

**Response**: Thank you for pointing to this issue. We agree that researchers need to be aware of this limitation. We added a paragraph explaining the above mentioned limitations of using databases for bibliometric analysis.

--Associated, free, software can be used with Web of Science or Scopus. Perhaps it is worth mentioning compatible services like Sci2, Pajek, and Ucinet.  
**Response**: Thank you for this insight. We added a paragraph detailing the prominent software tools used to further analyze and visualize data extracted from bibliometric databases.

Minor Concerns:  
Not sure what readership the authors have in mind for this work. Perhaps they could say who is their target audience.  
**Response**: the target audience would be any researcher want analyze publication trend in any discipline. We clarified this in the introduction, and further more in the discussion.

The authors should say why they chose Jordan as the subject.

**Response**: We chose Jordan as it is not straightforward to do bibliometric analysis for a country (in contrast to a subject), and Jordan specifically is poorly studied in a bibliometric way and it can be an author name not only a country name, which will allow us to explain how to overcome this in the search. We added the explanation to the text.