

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

Sai-Leung Ng<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Chinese Culture University

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

Although this paper seems informative, I find the methodology problematic. For all bibliometric analyses, data quality is the prime consideration. To collect a representative sample, the researcher should follow a transparent and reproducible methodology that makes the analysis replicable (Tranfield et al., 2003). The protocol usually involves four steps: identification, screening, eligibility, and inclusion (Moher et al., 2009). Specific to this paper, I would ask: 1/ Did the author check whether there were duplicate publications? 2/ Did the author discard those non-research documents, e.g., editorials, announcements, etc.? Of course, there are more questions to be asked about the data quality. I hope my comments can help the author to revise this paper.

## References

Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., & Altman, D.G., (2009). Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. *British Medical Journal*, 339(July), 1–8.

Tranfield, D., Denyer, D., & Smart, P. (2003). Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review. *British Journal of Management*, 14: 207-222.