My thanks to the Reviewer for their comments. I offer the following responses:

**Reviewer 3 writes:**

(26) (95) One or more references regarding the historical formation of the issue-based system in academic publishing may be required to properly analyze and discuss about its development. The identification of the principle of scarcity as a lever for maintaining a model is relevant in the discussion. But it should perhaps be contextualized in the use of a pre-existing model.

**Author response:**

I added additional information and references in the paragraph containing line 95.

**Reviewer 3 writes:**

(i.e. 201) Furthermore, it would be necessary to refer to journals that have already adopted a different publication model (if they have a JIF it would be useful to briefly analyze its trend), for example Plos One, PeerJ journals (which are cited by the author regarding indexing issues in MEDLINE).

**Author response:**

I made additional references to these in the paragraph starting at line 216.

**Reviewer 3 writes:**

(195) The author focuses on cons of information retrieval and some aspects of metadating and indexing: in this regard it may be useful to mention the DOI and the article number, which have become mandatory-like metadata fields for journals that have gone beyond the system based on issues. PIDs and IDs are relevant in analyzing any topic related to bibliographic citation and information retrieval. It may be useful to add some information on journals that are indexed in MEDLINE while not having a issue-based publishing.

**Author response:**

I added information about that around line 176.

**Reviewer 3 writes:**

(238) Nowadays, some online services, ie. like Unpaywall, are adding value to paper versioning. Unpaywall is linking available open versions to articles, both natively on some publisher sites, or by browser extension, and its information are displayed databases such as Scopus, Web of Science, EPMC. Many tools or discovery services are already integrating this feature.

**Author response:**

Thank you for highlighting this. I think these tools are valuable, but they are also hacks, unfortunately. What I’m addressing here is a collective need to address the issue of journal issues.

**Reviewer 3 writes:**

(245) The conclusions section does not adequately address the large number of journals that already make full-text articles available in HTML, both on proprietary platforms or through OJS. Obviously, the availability of full-text, and its contents, depends much more on accessibility (paywall or open access) than on the formats in which they are released. The conclusions both on machine readable availability and on the submission and reading systems may seem a bit dated compared to the publication environments used by many readers and authors. Perhaps an examination of the positive aspects (if any) for readers and authors of issue-based publishing could make the discussion more balanced. The lack of pros does not make the cons less relevant.

The related bibliography should be promptly inserted.

**Author response:**

Thank you. My intent, though, is to focus on the even larger set of journals that have not adopted to digital workflows. I don’t agree that it’s necessary to survey journals that publish in HTML to make my argument.

**Reviewer 3 writes:**

Another topic to be treated briefly, and not only regarding e-pub ahead of print, is digital paper versioning or / and the availability of preprint servers and repository. A reference, not only in the introduction, to open science and the open access workflow would make the argument (on the cons of issue-based publishing) stronger. The relevant bibliography should be promptly inserted.

**Author response:**

I addressed pre-prints to make the point that the journal as a digital library should also include providence data about articles it publishes.