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Reviewer's report:

I appreciate the authors' changes, and thank them for their work.
I'd have given more importance to the SOAP report e.g. at the end of page 2: "APC has grown rapidly etc.": it is true, but it is neither so widely accepted nor irrelevant to the peer review process, as many OA opponents state [but this is another issue, I know] . I'd add at least this SOAP finding at page 7: funding for APC is considered a barrier by 39% of the respondents...
The answers ratio about "Do you think OA undermine peer review" at page 6 should also be cited and taken into consideration in the Background section to reinforce the reasons of your study.
The SOAP project as of now is the most complete overview of OA publishing landscape, and should be adequately used and cited where perfectly fitting, as in your case.

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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