**Response to Reviewer 1: Ethan White**

Because of potential confusion with comparisons, I changed all correlations to Spearman correlations. This should avoid problems with comparisons between Pearson and Spearman correlations. Spearman was appropriate for all pairwise comparisons because it assumes monotonic, but not necessarily linear relationships. This was clarified in the text (methods and results) and in figure 1. It did not change any of the interpretation in the discussion.

I added a Principal Components Analysis as suggested by Dr. White. The methods are described on lines 85-88. The results are presented on lines 112-115 and in figure 2. The results are discussed on lines 122-132 at the beginning of the discussion and around line 209.

Upon rereading what I wrote, I see Dr. White was correct in suggesting that I was unclear about the primary focus of the San Francisco DORA. I clarified this as suggested near the end of the discussion in lines ~280-285. I also included reference to Garfield 2006 where the creator of the JIF indicates that it should not be used to evaluate researchers based on the journals they publish in.

Table 2. clarified the Eigenfactor and Article influence background trends as stable based on examination of data from Eigenfactor.org.

I made all of the minor corrections suggested by Dr. White.

**Response to Reviewer 2: Carl Bergstrom**

I relation to the PCA added in response to Dr. White’s suggestions, I also include discussion of the Bollen et al. 2009 paper suggested by Dr. Bergstrom.

I added the reference to the West et al. 2010 paper that was apparently missing, most notably from the first sentence of the discussion. The reference was likely lost during a previous revision, because my interpretation of the correlations was influenced significantly by this paper.

My attempt to generalize the interpretation of the network metrics led to a misinterpretation with respect to *Molecular Ecology* and *American Naturalist*, as Dr. Bergstrom noted. I have modified the language and interpretation as per the suggestions around lines 147-154.