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The Editor,
BMC Medical Research Methodology

Re: Submission of revised version of MS No. 1494984165008614 entitled
“Representation of less-developed countries in Pharmacology journals: an online survey of corresponding authors”

Dear Editor,

First of all, I am really thankful to get my manuscript reviewed by thoroughly professional reviewers. I must say that reviewers have raised very genuine and valid concerns. I have revised the manuscript based on their suggestions except one. The revised parts in the manuscript are highlighted with yellow colour. The detailed point by point response to Editors is provided on the next pages.

I hope the revised version will now be suitable for publication in BMC Medical Research Methodology.

Thank you very much.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Dileep K. Rohra,
Associate Professor (Pharmacology),
Alfaisal University, Riyadh
Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
Tel. +966-0-1-215-7675
Fax +966-0-1-215-7651
E mail: drohra@alfaisal.edu
David Resnik:
1. Manuscript has been checked by two of my colleagues who are native English speakers (their names have been included in Acknowledgements). These colleagues identified several problems with the language, which have been corrected.
2. Impact factor has been defined and its significance has been discussed in Introduction (P 4 last paragraph & P 5 first paragraph).

J Petrak:
A. Background:
1. First paragraph has been omitted.
2. Second paragraph has been shortened (now first paragraph in revised version).
3. The last two sentences have been omitted.

B. Methods:
1. Methodology has been elaborated (P6, first paragraph).
2. There were journals that were not included in the analysis because of the methodological issues (not accounting for the Pharmacology related terms). This has been taken care of by adding a limitation on P 18, last sentence of Discussion.
3. “How did the author review the journal issue?”
   This has been clarified on P 6, last two sentences.
4. “According to the list of OECD member countries ------------ 30 member states”
   That is true that during the time of data collection, there were 30 member states. Let me elaborate that when study was being designed, I visited the website of OECD, only 27 countries were mentioned as members. Accordingly, the protocol for data collection was made. After the data collection period, I observed that OECD comprised of 30 nations & now at the time the submission of manuscript, membership has swollen to 34. That is why I have categorically mentioned this phenomenon in Discussion (P 13, second paragraph).
5. “What was the list of questions ----------- ”
   The exact questionnaire has been added to the manuscript as an Appendix.

C. Results:
1. “Am I wrong ----------- 4 OECD countries?”
No, not at all. The reviewer is absolutely right. The explanation to this is the same as above that after the data collection, 7 countries were made members of OECD. These 4 are from those 7. Once again, I must sat that this has been clearly mentioned in Discussion.

2. “Regarding IF, it is necessary --------- be then more persuasive”

This is the only comment, which I am not comfortable to comply with. These results can be added in no time but basically, this was not the objective of the study. Analysis of journals & the discussion on it will take me to somewhere else. This is entirely a separate topic.

Discussion:

a & b. I am really thankful to Dr Petrak for these nice comments. I fully agree with him. These comments have led me to change the direction of the Discussion & in the revised version this section has been extensively rewritten.

Discretionary Revisions:

1. The title has been changed as suggested.