

Review of: "Mapping the Canadian Research Landscape in 2023"

Mar Banuet¹

¹ University of Alberta

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article describes the publication trends of Canadian universities. To strengthen the article, several issues need to be addressed.

First, the introduction describes the importance of research publications and why it is critical to analyze this production. However, it is long and redundant, and the research question is not clear. I suggest reducing the redundant parts and describing examples that show that analyzing publication trends is relevant. Also, the authors need to justify "why focusing on Canada and why 2023 only." This could be mentioned in the introduction and described in the methods section.

Second, the methods section can be strengthened with a little more description. The first paragraph has the same information as the points below. Adding the definition or a broader explanation of the inclusion criteria of the institutions included would help understand this criteria without having to follow an external link. Moreover, the authors should explain why they chose to use only Scopus as the data source. Further description of the inclusion and exclusion criteria would improve this section. For example, what happens if the author has two affiliations and the Canadian one is the second one? Does it matter, or is it not relevant? Also, the authors need to add how they analyzed the data obtained.

To understand the results, I would suggest also explaining how the authors defined the areas of research used to classify articles. Is there a previous definition they used or based their classification on? Or did they use the database definition classification?

Figure 1: Should the Y-axis say "number of publications/articles" or something similar, and the X-axis say "area of research"? Should "publications" be singular, as in "number of publications/articles"? The X-axis should say "area of research"?

Are systematic reviews classified as reviews or articles? The 'articles' classification is broad and used differently throughout the paper. A description or definition of how they classified research outputs should be included.

The discussion (embedded in the results) must include comparisons with similar research and properly cite and reference it. A deeper discussion on how these results can help Canadian universities should be included. Right now, it seems to be a mere description and summary, but adding the potential impact and use may add more value.

