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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Dr. Kowalczuk,

We thank you for your quick response to our resubmission of “Guidelines for open peer review implementation” and are very happy that you have accepted the article in principle. Again, we wish to thank you and your reviewers for the very helpful comments provided, which have undoubtedly assisted us in improving the manuscript. You and one reviewer make some important final points. We detail below our responses.

We hope these final changes will mean the article is ready for publication, but please let us know if anything else requires attention.

Sincerely,

Tony Ross-Hellauer and Edit Gorogh

Our responses to comments are below in the format:

Reviewer Comment
>Author Response

Editor

I have noticed you don't seem to have responded to this comment from Reviewer 2: "One issue missing is whether confidential comments to editors should be allowed and if so, how they are handled." Please could you add to your manuscript a clarification about confidential comments.
Thanks for spotting this! Added text: “A related issue here is the status of confidential reviewer messages to the editor – should these be allowed, will they be published later? If not, consider adding a further disclaimer to any published reports that these comments have been omitted”

Reviewer1

Other studies also report a generally positive attitude towards open peer review (5). You use plural, but you list only 1 reference here. (5)

>Added reference

Next, as open in B1 is not necessary

>Word removed

Also, when it comes to section B - perhaps communicating your goals B1 should come after being sensitive B2, and maybe even after conducting a survey B3. Also perhaps in B1 (whatever number it may end up being - they should also consider asking the community what it thinks about their goals - as to me it isn't really clear do you recommend them to first tell the community what their plan is - or to consult the community beforehand). Perhaps you could add a comment that Bs could be in different order then currently presented.

>We have reordered as suggested. Also included a note in B1 (now B3) that community feedback should be sought.

At the end of A3 - perhaps mention - check C1/2.

>Done

I still see a big overall between F2 and D1 - perhaps F2 is not needed

>We assume “overall” should be “overlap” – in which case, we see some overlap but believe both sections are necessary. We think there is an important difference between deciding pre-hoc to be pragmatic in approach and adjusting course if necessary post-hoc. We’ve added some text to link these two sections and note the overlap, however.
I would put G4 as G2

> We kindly disagree.

I feel H should include commentary on handling or overseeing the derogatory or defamatory remarks. Or disclaimers that the reports are not edited in any way.

> We have added text to specifically address this issue: “Clear policies should be in place for editors handling or overseeing any derogatory or defamatory remarks, and these should be publicly available on the peer review policy pages of the journal website. Where changes or redactions occur as a result in the published reports, a disclaimer could be added to indicate this is the case.”

Open participation- perhaps mention that even in preprint communities - sometimes the commenting is scares - e.g. see bioRxiv: a progress report - http://asapbio.org/biorxiv

> We think this point is already made, as we refer to open participation processes in general.