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General
Resubmitted manuscript

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

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

The authors did not change the original interpretation and presentation of their results. Original research can not survive with investigators stuck on the IF of journals they will publish their work. Aiming at the journal of a future publication and not at the hypothesis to produce a research protocol is not scientific, is not academic either.
In the 2nd paragraph of their response to Reviewer's 2 comments they claim that the focus of their paper is not the extraordinary papers but the normal scientific production in public health field! I don't understand their point. To study the course of journals IF (of public health or whatever else) sounds useful for the journals but not to guide the authors.

Finally, it would be easier for the reader to understand the ranking of the journals cohortizing them by ten or even less than 10 instead of giving the IFs of 80 journals, for each journal separately. This method of presentation renders comparisons between the journals not feasible. The authors claim that data for each individual journal are lost. However the individual data of each journal do not give me the slightest idea about their ranking over time.

The revised manuscript does not answer to the original criticisms and slightly differs from the manuscript submitted originally.

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

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

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
What next?: Reject because scientifically unsound

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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