Reviewer #1: I appreciate what the authors have provided in this response, but it seems somewhat obvious and potentially a bit misinformed.  Of course some of the OA journals are selective, and certainly the OA-option in traditional journals should not change the selectivity of those journals. In my original letter, I stated "Many scientists ﬁnd compelling reasons to publish open-access papers with traditional journals or to follow in the new wave of open-access-only e-journals, the latter of which typically place emphasis on scholarship that is sound, not on novelty, rigor, or likely impact." Indeed, my key message was to not uncritically jump on the bandwagon, and to "know what you are getting".

**Our issue is that the idea that some OA journals are selective was impossible to discern from the original letter, and that is all that we want to set straight. We agree that scientists should know what they’re getting, and the problem is that Agrawal’s letter read at face value suggests that scientists get very little from OA journals. This is sometimes the case, and we now make that very clear by pointing out that there are a lot of bad OA journals. However, it is often not the case, and the only point of our letter is to point out that most of the popular and reputable OA journals convey a lot of information about the publications they contain, are sometimes highly selective, and can be leaders in their field.**

The list of relevant OA journals that are actively published papers in plant science, ecology, evolution, medicine, etc., provided by the Lanfear and Pennell could easily be quadrupled (how was this list chosen?). I suspect that the first 100 titles that could be added would anchor the list towards the bottom, that is, primarily add low impact, low service, and low selectivity journals.  To be clear, I believe that publishing in these venues may be valuable and rewarding - author should simply know what they are getting.  Oh, and as we all know, we should be careful about interpreting impact factors - they are dynamic, changing, and easily manipulated.

**We now clarify how the list was compiled in the second paragraph. We make clear that it is not comprehensive, and that we are not trying to make general statements about the ‘average’ OA journal.**

Reviewer  #2: I think the paper makes a number of good points in response to the opinion piece that the journal originally published. I think the original opinion piece made an obvious factual error in equating OA with no (or a very permissive) review process, as such I think this response should be published.

**Thanks.**

Reviewer #3: This seems very straightforward to me.  The letter correctly sets the record straight, is clearly written and well argued while remaining civil. I have no reason to doubt the data and I am confident their simple point is correct.  This does seem like a sufficiently important point to deserve this brief airing.  I suggest this ought to be published as is.

**Thanks.**