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Reviewer's report:

This is very timely and well studied article. Researchers have identified few evidence-based characteristics to distinguish predatory journals from legitimate journals. In the light of sudden explosion of dubious journals these indicators may serve as useful markers for scientific community, universities and other academic agencies.

Authors have rightly mentioned efforts like Beall's list and guidance from agencies like COPE. It is very important that this knowledge is spread across universities especially from countries like India and China from where majority of young authors fall prey to dubious journals. Few Universities have taken proactive steps and issued guidelines for research publications. For instance http://unipune.ac.in/uop_files/Report-Guidelines_20-5-15.pdf.

Indian Association of Medical Journal Editors have published an editorial in key its key member journals. This has helped regulatory agencies to fine tune their actions against predatory journals. For instance http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0975947616300201

It will be appropriate to cite these efforts so that the useful work of researchers reaches to the right target audience.
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