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Reviewer’s report:

No major compulsory revisions

The authors have responded well to the questions raised. Wherever they did not provide an answer, they convincingly argued that this would either require far more work, or would be a different topic altogether.

Minor essential revisions:

1. "not for the proposed significance" ---- remove "proposed"
2. psedojournal ---- pseudo-journal
3. In the John Bohannon experiment, why would "predatory" journals reject any article. This goes against the purely economic interpretation of their behaviour. Could a couple of sentences try to account for an attitude that, on the surface, should be commended?
4. ...peer review practice are so deficient that..." --- add "often" after "are"
5. ...in 2013 to over a one thousand in 2014 ---- remove the "a" before "one"
6. ..."Western" journals at the same time as university administrations... --- "Western" journals while, at the same time, university administrations...
7 ...a couple of published studies of the volume... ---- replace "of" by "about"
8. The sentence that begins with "It is for instance often very difficult to find out..." should be rewritten as two sentences: "For instance, it is often very difficult to find out in which country the publisher operates in practice. At the same time, authors and institutions are often assumed to base their evaluation of a journals at least in part on the publisher's location..."
9 ... and found that totally 11,873... ---- ... and found that in toto 11,873 (or a total of 11,873...)
10 In terms of APC charged... - rewrite as: Finding how much journals collecting APCs charged was straightforward, but some journals...
11. ... journals have less than 5 artciles --- replace "less" by "fewer"
12. ... a few outlier articles with very long delays: this is puzzling as such journals often claim to provide a very rapid turn-around time. Any explanation beyond noise or entropy?
The authors can be trusted to make these revisions.

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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