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PDF covering letter
Response to referee's comments:

I thank referee 1 for the extensive review. I greatly appreciate the many constructive comments, some of which have been very stimulating to further thought. I hope the more specific study of dermatological impact factors will have given support to the points presented.

I have specifically dealt with the points raised as follows or have the following comments:

1. Citations density vs. Size of field. These two factors cannot be independent, although there is of course no monocausal relationship between the two and many other factors are involved. The theoretical top impact factor of a field with only one journal is invariably smaller than that of a field with 100 journals.
2. There is a given amount of research available for publication. As a publishing author I do not see the total amount of research possible as static or limited as implied.
3. The highest vs the average impact factor. The text has been amended accordingly.
4. Cited reference half-life. Certainly these factors are important, but they were not the topic studied.
5. Science citation vs. JCR. The error has been corrected.
6. High quality means high impact because of best journals. Of hand this statement appears to be a tautology.
7. New journals will have low impact unless they attract good papers. I agree, and have amended the text accordingly.
8. Definition of speciality and statistics. JCR definitions and standard statistics have been used.
9. Calculation of impact factor. The calculations have been made by the JCR, and their given figures form the core data.
10. References. I have unfortunately not been able to access referee 1’s home-page.

Dr Wallin's comments have specifically been dealt with in the following manner:

1. The fact that letters, editorials etc may affect the impact factor has been included in the text on page 6, 1 par, last sentence (reference 6).
2. The Matthew factor has been included in the discussion on page 5, 1. par, 2nd last sentence, reference 5.

I am also pleased to note that Dr Wallin has kindly described my observations as 'striking', and hope that you
will find the now much improved manuscript acceptable for publication.