*We thank the reviewers again for evaluating our revised manuscript. We have made some minor additions to the section about pre-registration at the suggestion of the first reviewer.*

The authors have addressed the concerns raised well. I think the article is a timely, well written, and informative addition to the literature that I would like to recommend this for publication.  
I have a few mirror comments with regards some of the new sections that the authors may wish to consider, if they are given the opportunity, but I do not think these changes are completely necessary.

In the new section describing pre-registration (from line 264), it might be worth mentioning that some journals offer grantee of publication (if protocols are stuck to) irrespective of null findings. This is what prevents publication bias, not pre-registration per se. Most journals differentiate between pre-registration (which guards against other questionable research practices such as p-hacking and HARKing) and Registered Reports which are a type of pre-registration but with the additional guarantee and peer reviewer from a journal prior to data collection. If the authors wishes to include this differentiation I think it might help the readers understanding. However, I appreciate that these terms are often used interchangeably. I also appreciate that this does not site perfectly with the scheme set out in figure 1, but as Registered Reports are becoming more broadly accepted, with over 240 participating journals, including many specialising in ecology (see <https://www.cos.io/our-services/registered-reports?_ga=2.14444030.83877480.1591349264-1270378436.1498895408>), I would recommend mention of them.

*We agree that the distinctions noted between pre-registration and registered reports are important to mention, particularly as they relate to publication bias. The following was added starting line 246: “Registered reports can also be used as a publishing format where an initial study design is peer-reviewed and the article is provisionally accepted by a journal if the results are created with methods that do not deviate from the accepted design. This promotes greater coverage in the primary literature of null conclusions that otherwise may not have been published, reducing bias for publishing positive results.”*

Also, the authors differentiate between exploratory and applied research implying that pre-registration could be useful for declaring research to be exploratory (lines 277-280). I found this confusing, although again this is likely to be subject specific. Commonly, amongst the open science community, the relevant distinction is between exploratory (i.e. not pre-registered, where data is explored) and confirmatory (pre-registered) analyses.

*We have added content starting line 249: “Studies are typically methods-focused where a research product is developed to address a management or regulatory need, rather than a specific research question with a testable hypothesis.”*

*We have also replaced text on line 250-252 that stated “exploratory or applied” with “applied or methods-focused”.*