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Reviewer's report:

General

This is relevant and useful piece of research with considerable implications for the pediatrics community when selecting a medium for the dissemination of research results that should be incorporated into practice. It challenges the trend towards measuring journal impact factor that many journal editorial boards are currently pursuing, and suggests instead, based on the evidence of the findings, that the value of a journal may lie more in its ability to reach a core readership of practitioners. Its finding, that there is little correlation between journal impact factor and actual readership of a journal, within a specific discipline, is an important one.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
None required

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Tables and Figures need some revision.

All need checking, and some revision and clarification.
Table 3 in particular needs clarification- categories of participants are not clearly labelled, nor is the overlap between categories such as principle role: tertiary, and with/without academic responsibility clear. What is the total number of respondents represented in this table, and are some included in more than one category? etc.
Table 4 is hard to read/interpret.
Table 5 contains explanatory notes at the bottom, attached to symbols which don't appear in the table itself. Figures 2, 3 and 4 have more columns than labels. Each set of columns needs a clear label.

References
There are some errors in the list of references

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

Overall, although the content, and the method and findings, appear sound, the writing quality is uneven, and at times the sense is hard to follow. This, plus the elementary errors in tables and figures (and the references) have a negative impact on the reader's confidence in the quality of the work underlying the paper. I recommend the authors take the opportunity to revise the paper to ensure readability and accuracy in the presentation of the background, method and the findings.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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

Statistical review: No
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