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Reviewer's report:

Dear Tony and Edit,

Thank you for making the extensive changes I asked for, I hope you agree with me that the article is now much nicer. Here are a few additional suggestions you may consider, but I find the article already now ready for publication:

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

2) Next, as openin in B1 is not necessary

3) 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.

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

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

6) I would put G4 as G2

7) 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.-.
8) 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

Kind regards,

Mario
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