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**Reviewer’s report:**

The revisions have improved the paper but I still have some comments

**Major compulsory revisions**

3) “We therefore set out to elucidate the coverage of these four domains Uniform Requirements, trial registration, conflicts of interest and reporting guidelines of good publication practice in Open Access pediatric journals and compare the results with findings from “conventional” JCR-indexed pediatric journals.”

This objective implies that you will make a direct comparison. It is not clear enough in the paper where the results from the JCR journals came from. There should be a clear statement in the methods about this dataset and a reference. Currently this information is buried in the Introduction. The data from the JCR analysis should be presented for comparison.

4) New results are discussed in the Discussion section that do not appear in the Results eg results of the geographic analysis.

5) Discussion – “We assume that our results are not specific to pediatrics and may be found if reproduced in journals from in general medicine or other specialties”

You can not make this assumption. We simply do not know if the results are generalisable to other disciplines.

6) The paper would benefit from a table of results. Data from the JCR journals could also be included.

**Minor essential revisions**

1) The following statement on p6 should be referenced:

“It has been argued that electronic Open Access publishing does not change significantly content and quality of research articles but improve access to research findings”
2) p6: “We wondered whether journals adopting this new publication model might be more keen and flexible in taking up the above-mentioned recommendations”

This study does not assess whether the journals are "keen". To do so you would need to interview the editors. This word should be removed. Indeed the word flexible is not really appropriate throughout. You are really assessing whether they do or do not list policies etc.
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