

I thank the reviewer for her/his positive comments.

1. **Although the case study is well defined considering only the journals of a specific publisher within a well-determined time frame, a clear description of the research question is lacking. Is this just a statistical analysis or does it provide implications on the publication of papers in these journals (as it seems from the conclusions)?.**

Indeed, this comment is similar to the one from referee #1, and we agree that our scientific goals were not correctly described. We have tried to highlight them more in the revised version. Beside the pure statistical analysis (already interesting per se) the main goal of the present paper is to investigate if publications in different sectors, but with the same layout, would have the same references per page density. This has been indeed confirmed by our study.

2. **Stating that “pages or references limit should be strongly avoided in journals, as authors could be discouraged to describe their study with sufficient details” is quite a strong conclusion that requires a further discussion and a deeper analysis. Furthermore, given the analysed data, which refer only to some specific EGU Open Access journals in a specific time frame, it is not possible to get to this general conclusion;**

I agree with the referee this to be a quite strong statement, and indeed this is not fully correct. Based on the reply to referee #1, in fact, many journals with page restrictions do allow (electronic) supplements where additional details (or data) can be listed. Therefore I decided to remove this sentence/conclusion which is not confirmed by any results of this paper.

3. **Although the text is overall well written and easy to read, a better distribution of the information has to be considered. For example, the first paragraphs of the section “Temporal trends” would better fit the “Introduction” section. Moreover, once the research question is clearly defined, more space could be given to the discussion of the results, which here seems quite limited.**

I thank the referee for pointing this out. I have moved the first paragraph of “Temporal trends” under the “Introduction”, and I tried to clarify our objective even more in the paper (see reply to first question). I am however hesitant to discuss more results than the one

presented here, as I believe that more in-depth analysis, with a larger body of journals, would be necessary to draw any general conclusions outside the one already mentioned in the paper.

All the technical corrections have been implemented in the revised version of the manuscript.