|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Reviewer: 1 | | |
| 1.1 | The methodological part description should be improved to facilitate the understanding. | ? |
| 1.2 | The presentation and description of the results could be improved for a better understanding, including the tables. | Remove “change from preprint to publication?”  Improve contents of first column in Table 3 |
| 1.3 | I would like to suggest the replacement of the terms “more open” and “more closed” for more suitable terms. | Twitter?  Other researchers?  Stuck with current labels as matches categories – but defined better. |
| 1.4 | The results on the abstract must be revised. Some values are different from those showed on the results section. Also, there is a sentence that is not correct. Please, revise. | Different denominators? |
| Reviewer: 2 | | |
| 2.1 | My only suggestion would be that it might be interesting to discuss the number of papers that are NOT open despite being published in a journal that requires open data (22 out of 55 according to Table 2). Were these journals that just encouraged rather than required open data, or were papers published despite not following the policy? I would be very interested to know how almost half the papers in this category ended up not having open data. | Likely that those without cannot share patient data. Or just got missed? Will need to have a look  22 weren’t available + Discuss legitimate and less legitimate reason as descriptive paragraph |