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I appreciate my previous suggestions meant a lot of work for the authors. The manuscript has improved by the revisions and seems to be easier to read. I have only a few minor comments which may be addressed at the authors discretion:

I still do not understand how publication rates can be overestimated other than by responder bias in survey based follow up - a problem you don't mention in this context. How would you define the true value?

Figure 1: I you take "new information" as the basis, you need to include an arrow leading directly from the uppermost box ("new information") to "full publication", a flow you could not examine. As an alternative, delete the uppermost box and start the flowchart from "abstract submission....", in accordance with your study.

The conclusions are too long, some of it may be incorporated into the discussion.
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