September 13, 2016

To UOJM,

Re: **Predatory Journals: Do Not Enter**

Dear Nima Nahiddi,

Thank you very much for accepting our manuscript conditional upon satisfactory revisions as requested. Below are our responses to address the concern raised by the reviewers.

We have attached a revised version of our manuscript, as well as a version with the changes outlined.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reviewer A** | **Authors’ Response** |
| - Very well-written - Clear and concise explanation of predatory journals - Provided excellent resources for trainees to use to avoid predatory journals | Thank you. No response required. |
| Global health piece could have been explored further; for example, impact of manuscripts lost to predatory journals not reaching professionals in second/third world countries needing the information | Please refer to the response to comment 3 of Reviewer C, below. |
| See Track Changes for minor comments/edits in uploaded file. | We have accepted all the minor edits within the text. In regard to the URLs within the text, we have now moved them to either the references or Table 2 as appropriate.  The only URL within the text now is for the Think, Check, Submit Initiative (Line 75), as we believe it is best to keep both the URL and the reference for this in the text. |
| **Reviewer B** |  |
| - The author(s) speak to prevalence and consequences of the existence of predatory journals on scientific publication, communication and advancement in science/medicine. - They provide resources to existing lists of predatory journals, and they also provide a table of characteristics and an analysis of a typical “scam” email | No response required. |
| The authors define predatory journals early in the text, prior to the headline “what are predatory journals and why do they exist?”. I suggest re-working the text to have definitions of predatory journals early in the text, prior to discussing their consequences. | We have re-worked the text and have started the “What are predatory journals?” as a separate section (Line starting at line 29) earlier in the text prior to discussing their consequences. |
| -I would encourage the authors to substitute subjective words like “bogus”, “wasted”, “wasteful”, “ugly”, and “annoyingly” for more sophisticated words  - I would suggest that the authors review the entire manuscript for grammatical error and soundness.  -       Abbreviation requiring definition for line 48 | We have now minimized the use of subjective word (e.g. ugly, wasted, bogus).  We have reviewed our manuscript for grammatical errors and soundness.   We have now provided definition for the abbreviation of APCs as requested (Line 55). |
| - Comment on future direction of the manuscript: it would be interesting if the authors could comment on whether a standardized regulatory body should be conceived, and that all journals need to meet certain standardized criteria in order to be credible | We have now included a comment on future directions in the conclusion (Line 134) |
| - Please comment further on line 41 – how will this directly impact patient care? Wouldn’t this be indirect given that all medical care guidelines are published in reputable sources? | Please refer to the response to comment 3 of Reviewer C, below. |
| **Reviewer C** |  |
| Dear author,  Thank you very much for allowing me to review your commentary on predatory journals. It is almost a consensus in the scientific community of the ill effects that predatory journals have in spreading scientific knowledge. Thank you for broadening my knowledge in the field. | No response required. |
| Abstract felt jumpy and should be re-worded to be more coherent. | We have now reworded the abstract to make it more coherent. |
| Line 39-41 - appears to place the entire problem on predatory journals. It would be worthwhile to pursue the pressure many researchers face in publishing these articles as opposed to mentioning it in one sentence. | We have revised the section on the impact of predatory journals on patient care/global health, and incorporated that it is the combined effect of the academic pressure, the rigor of peer review, as well as the unethical publication practices of predatory journals that can result in harm to health information seeking patients and the general public, worldwide (Line 45). |
| Line 46-53 - this feels more speculative rather than based on facts (please list citations). | The section of this commentary pertaining to “Why do predatory journals exist?” is indeed mostly *speculative*, as it is unclear why they exist. |
| Grammar could use improvement.  Line 89 - please avoid using metaphors | We have reviewed our manuscript for grammatical errors and have removed the metaphor from Line 89 (now Line 94). |
| I do believe it could be elaborated more as it feels more of a review process. Since this issue of UOJM will focus on global health, it might be worthwhile to elaborate why predatory journals originate in low-income countries and seek researchers from these countries. | This was briefly addressed previously in the “Why do predatory journals exist?” (Line 54). |