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🌟 **Democratize publishing** via fair & collaborative peer-review and a crowd-sourced impact system
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🌟 **Disseminate science** via open-access publishing and social networking
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- Community-based and high-quality: journals are driven by large editorial boards of world-renown scientists.

- Peer-review and publication decisions are taken care of by external high-quality editorial boards, not by frontiers staff.

- frontiers provides the opportunity, platform and support, scientists take the responsibility for publishing.
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Peer review

- **Objective**: mandate is on objective issues and requires unanimous decision to accept or reject

- **Standardized**: detailed review templates

- **Collaborative & interactive**: authors and reviewers interact online in the *frontiers* Review Forum

- **Efficient & fast**: workflows & algorithms to automate peer-review

- **Responsibility & recognition**: reviewer disclosed upon acceptance and shown on articles
In sum, this is an interesting update to the authors’ previous (2013) Frontiers paper on the same topic, which might benefit from more complete discussion and citation of relevant work on human cognitive neuropsychology, attraction away from the particularities of the particular model, stricter definition and use of overused terms such as “connectivity”, and perhaps less exclusive reliance on bottom-up neurocognitive developmental influences.

This was a fantastic, most thorough and hugely helpful review report of our paper. We really appreciate it and think that it benefited the paper a lot.

All my concerns have been addressed with modifications or rebuttals and I think that this paper is ready to go. I have reviewed only the YELLOW regions of this revision and have not reread the entire manuscript. I have added a few grammatical notes here and there, and otherwise, I have just a few comments which the authors can consider and accept or reject without my review bee me.

Page 25: “Cataanux and colleagues found that minuscule are in general narrower and more numerous” — although most readers do make this claim, if one reads Cataanux’s paper closely one finds that the “more numerous” claim is actually an inference, not an observation. The observation is that atomic minuscule are smaller. Especially because this oft total result comes nearly exclusively from one research group, it may be wise to keep direct observations distinct from the rhetoric in which they have been integrated — which has been helpful with us in the past on similar issues.
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Field:
- Neuroscience (12)
- Psychology (2)
- Business (1)
- Communication Studies (1)
- Computer Science (1)
- History and Anthropology (1)
- Information and Communication Technology (1)
- Microbiology (1)
- Neurology (1)
- Physics (1)

Gender:
- Total: 6
- 18-24: 2
- 25-34: 1
- 35-44: 1
- 45+: 2

Position:
- Professor (3)
- Doctorate Student / Research Assistant (2)
- Experienced Professional (2)
- Researcher (2)
- Technician / Assistant (2)
- Assistant Professor (1)
- Associate Professor (1)
- Director (1)
- Entry Level (1)
- Post Doctoral Researcher (1)
- Senior Researcher (1)

Age:
- Number of authors
- 13-17: 1
- 18-24: 2
- 25-34: 4
- 35-44: 4
- 45+: 2
**Tiering:** popularize high-impact science

Most viewed Original Research Articles are checked by Chief Editors and selected to "climb the tier". Authors write a Focused Review around the high impact discovery.
launched in two major steps in 2010 and 2012
Network: follow concepts
Network: follow journals
Open access + networking = maximum dissemination

frontiers combines open-access publishing with research networking:

the perfect distribution system to increase visibility and impact of articles and scientists.
Open access + networking = maximum dissemination

★ article views increased by 30%
★ PDF downloads increased by 30%
★ profile views increased by 80%
Let’s work together!
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