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Reviewer’s report:

General Comments:

In this manuscript, Dr. Marusic, et al, using data collected from IMEMR, study the editorial quality and visibility of biomedical journals published in EMR. They report that many people round the globe are interested in articles with local relevance published in these journals, that many of the journals have sub-standard quality, and considering their importance in bridging the know-do gap, they should receive more attentions.

The IMEMR is really far from complete, is probably not representative for all journals published in the region and if the authors had access to more accurate data sources, say direct contact with journal offices in the region, they would have come to different results. Furthermore, as the authors state in their manuscript, there were many missing or ambiguous unclear items mainly for journals published in Arabic or Persian language. And, if the authors asked for help with one who knew these languages they may have found somewhat different findings. This also underlines the insufficiency of IMEMR in archiving the regional journals.

However, considering that the results of this manuscript is very well presented and discussed, and that access to data in a way other than that the authors did is very cumbersome, this study could be treated as a preliminary report to be followed by more complete studies. The authors appreciate their limitations and describe them well in the Discussion section.

Minor Essential Revisions:

All parts of the manuscript are well-written and logically structured. The only problem I found is in the Discussion where the authors mention that “this was the reason why we re-checked the indexing again in June 2010, to make sure that the data for 2009 are as complete as possible.” This section (a sensitivity analysis) should not be first mentioned in Discussion; the authors should first mention it in the Methods; present the findings in the Results and discuss the findings in Discussion.

Discretionary Revisions:

I could not access Reference 17; perhaps it is only for INASP users. If possible,
provide an open access reference instead.

I think for reporting non-normally distributed variables along with median, instead of reporting range as an index of dispersion, it would be better to report “interquartile range (75%ile-25%ile)” or “25%ile and 75%ile.”

Table S3: It would be better to include another column reporting number (%) of ambiguous/unclear items.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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