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Reviewer's report:

1) General comment: the work is sound, but the premises look weak or better the link between premises and work are weak. I mean: if you want to demonstrate that OA does not undermine the peer review system, then make a study of alternative and open kinds of peer review as conducted in OA journals. The equation good peer review-more citations does not convince. I'd try to reinforce it.

2) The question posed by the authors are new BUT should be better defined.

3) The methods are appropriate and well described, and provide sufficient details.

4) The data are sound.

5) The discussion and conclusions are well balanced and adequately supported by the data.

6) The title and abstract accurately convey what has been found.

7) The writing is acceptable.

Minor essential revisions:

- in the Background I suggest to include the interesting and perfectly fitting European SOAP - Study on Open Access Publishing findings, in order to give a more complete framework of the emergence and growth of Gold OA: http://project-soap.eu/

- In the paragraph Effects of the revenue model... there is a typo in line 2: compared as instead of compared as.

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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