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Reviewer's report:

Dear Authors,

Thank you for the opportunity to re-review this manuscript and for doing the additional analysis, here are my additional suggestions:

1) Conclusions Authors choose double-blind review more frequently when they submit to more prestigious journals, - this sentence is untrue, as only 12% chose this option, rephrase to say when they chose double blind then they are more likely to…

2) You still have interpretation in results, move lines 250 - 252 to discussion, as well as 282-248, and 399-401, 465-466

3) Report P values fully, unless <0,001 then write them as such.

4) and thus we cannot reject the null hypothesis that gender and review type are independent. In many instances, you say if you reject null hypothesis, this is not needed, just state if u found a significant difference.

5) Analysis at the out-to-review stage - can you please report the data in table 6, divided by the sister journals, nature, and nature communications, and include that in regression analysis for this section. And also include the journal tier for the outcome post-review. As you did show that journal tier does influence DBPR intake, u need to adjust for it in subsequent analyses.

6) Based on our experience, we are inclined to think that the Nature journals editors are not biased - While the authors may be inclined to think so, I would suggest omitting this whole sentence - as the only authors characteristics that the editors have access are possibly the gender - If they discern it from the names, and the institutions, or titles - but the prestige, previous works, and other factors may bias the editors - as has been shown in other studies.
And as you mention later. Therefore I would shorten this whole paragraph, and restrain from making conclusions on editors bias.

7) For SBPR papers, we 627 cannot reject the null hypothesis. - delete from discussion

8) Finally, regarding your regression analyses, please make it clear has the regression shown that all explored factors remain as independently associated with the outcomes, or not, and based on the results make it more clear in the discussion that other confounders seem more likely then the ones explored in this study to explain the data. Finally, do this only after you have added the journal tiers to the models as mentioned in point 5.

Kind regards,

Mario
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