BUENOS AIRES, May 22nd, 2017

Dear Reviewer,

Thank you very much for your comments. We have been able to work with all of them. Here is our answer to each one:

1. **What is the definition and perimeter of 'open science': the article provides  
   several elements throughout, yet, boundaries remain somewhat blurred at  
   times. For example, the article starts with a definition that reminds of  
   'online science' more than open science -- yet, not all open science  
   practices are on the Internet, and not all science on the Internet is open.**

We have re-write part of the introduction. We began by defining the concept of *open science* as it is used in this document, which makes it clear that we refer to a diverse set of practices that have in common the aim of increasing collaboration and sharing the outcomes, usually through ICTs. Although most collaborative practices in science are online, there are others that are not. We provided some examples.

1. **Similarly, considering the discussion in section 2, I was somewhat surprised  
   to see in the table that follows it 'public communication of science' among  
   the open science practices. On one hand, it is not really discussed in the  
   section itself; on the other hand, I do think that including science  
   communication in 'open science' is subject to interpretation and deserves  
   some literature discussion at least.**

We changed the name for the practice “Public communication of science” to “Dissemination of Science” which more accurately reflected our empirical data. We kept these practice in the analysis because we wanted to assess to what extent researchers were oriented towards scientific disclosure and improving accessibility to scientific knowledge. Traditionally this is not common practice among researchers, which negatively affects scientific democratization; clearly, one of the biggest goals for *open science*. We further justify the relevance and importance of this practice by quoting four papers on this topic (see footnote 6)

1. **Finally, while the policy-oriented conclusion is a good and thorough one,  
   the arguments it makes may be quite generally applied to open science and  
   move away from Argentina as soon as the first sentences are over. Perhaps  
   what the current legal framework and incentives are in this specific  
   countries could be elaborated upon more, and better linked to the results of  
   the survey.**

The whole conclusions referred to the Argentinean case. Sorry for the misunderstanding. We made it clearer in the current version. We started by referring to the national regulation on open access, which is exemplary for other developing countries. However, as we explained in the conclusions, policy has not been developed beyond that goal and we have identified several confusions and generally lack of information about open science practices, This drawback came together with researchers’ marked and increasing interests in those practices and their associated benefits. That is why we believe there is space for improvement in the promotion of opens science in Argentina.

Best wishes

Valeria Arza, Mariano Fressoli and Sol Sebastian