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We have made the formatting changes as requested.

Requested changes to sentences within the revised text are indicated below:

1. Abstract, page 2
   Original text:
   "current methods of measuring journal quality are flawed."
   New text:
   "Current methods of measuring the quality of journals assume that citations of articles within journals
   are normally distributed. Furthermore using journal impact factors to measure the quality of individual
   articles is flawed if citations are not uniformly spread between articles."

2. Method, page 6
   Old text:
   "Journals containing less than 20% review articles were defined as being primary research journals"
   New text:
   "For the purpose of this study, we defined journals containing less than twenty percent review
   articles as being a primary research journal."

3. Discussion, page 11
   Old text:
   "Reassuringly journals with the highest impact factors generally had a lower proportion of articles
   which are never cited."
   New text:
   "It appears that the journals with the highest impact factors generally had a lower proportion of
   articles which are never cited."

4. Discussion, page 11-12
   Old text:
   "Clinicians may read a journal which influences clinical practice but not ever cite this work
   themselves."
   New text:
   "It is reasonable to hypothesise that pure clinicians may read articles and journals which influence
   their clinical practice but never cite this work themselves."

Andy Weale
Mick Bailey
Paul Lear