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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor,

Thank you for your response on our revised manuscript. We have been through the comments and made the necessary changes in the manuscript. Below we provide a detailed response (in italic) to each reviewer/editorial point raised, describing what changes have been made to the manuscript text and the figures.

1. Please include, at the end of the methods section, a statement unequivocally declaring that the abstracts were invented. We also require changes to SF 1, 2, 3 and 4 (supplementary file 2)

Response: We have added a statement declaring that the abstracts were invented in the methods section.

We now write (see methods section, page 6, line 114-115):

Statement: To prevent a potential confusion, we would like to underline that the abstracts were invented.

2. Please change the figure legends form ‘Pubmed style abstract’ to ‘Pubmed style fake abstract’.
Response: we have changed the legends of the SF1-4 and underline that the abstracts are fake. See Supplementary Figures SF1-4.

3. For the named journal (Arch Clin Psychiatry) please blur out/omit the journal name.
Response: We have omitted the journal name in the figures. See Supplementary figures SF 1-4.

4. Any other mentions of the journal name in the article should be changed to ‘A well-known psychiatry journal’ or similar
Response: We have blurred the journal name in the supplementary figures and in the text of the manuscript. See methods section, page 5, line 82.

5. Please also ensure the copyright line is blurred, the line started “© Copyright 2014….”
Response: We have blurred the line with the Copyright 2014 in the supplementary figures SF 1-4.

6. The Pubmed ID used for each of the supplementary material figures (25364263) appears to be the same as this published manuscript http://europepmc.org/abstract/med/25364263. Therefore to avoid confusion please blur out/omit this PMID
Response: We have blurred out the Pubmed ID in the supplementary figures SF 1-4.

7. The DOI used 10.4188/JCP.11r07596 is not a currently assigned DOI however since both “10.4188” and “/JCP” are used by journals please blur out/omit the DOI in all mentioned images.
Response: We have blurred out the DOI in all 4 supplementary figures (SF 1-4)

Response: We have blurred out the reference to other articles. Now it is not possible to read this information anymore. See SF 1-4.
9. Finally, update all figure captions to include something similar to ‘the manuscript has been altered to remove references to journal title, pubmed ID, copyright,… where this information was the same as real world entities. In the original study this information was unblurred to better mimic a PubMed abstract’

Response: we have added this sentence to the figure captions of SF 1-4.

Additional Editorial comments:

1. In both the Ethics approval and consent to participate and Methods section, please clarify whether consent was implied by the completing and submitting the survey or whether consent was sought electronically.

Response: Consent was specified by stating that the respondents agreed to participate when they completed the survey.

We now write (see methods section, page 7, line 130-131): “Consent to participate was implied by following the link to the survey and completing the survey.

AND in the declaration of the ethical approval See page 17, line 357-358): Consent to participate was implied by following the link to the survey and completing the survey.

2. Please ensure that all additional files are explicitly referred to in the main text. Any items which do not meet these requirements may be deleted by our production department.

Response: We have checked whether all additional files are explicitly referred to in the manuscript.

3. Please proofread and ensure that when you upload your revised submission that it is in the final form for publication. Please remove any tracked changes, colored text, or highlighting and include only a single clean copy of the manuscript. Should you wish to respond to these revision requests, please include the information in the designated input box only.

Response: we have proofread the final version of the manuscript.

If anything is unclear in the final approval process, don’t hesitate to contact us.

We are happy to provide more information.

Thank you for your help,
Best wishes, also on behalf of the other authors,

Joeri Tijdink, MD PhD

Amsterdam UMC, location VUmc Amsterdam