Dear Prof. Nikolić, Editor-in-Chief

We would like to express our gratitude for your swift and insightful comments that helped us to deliver additional value to the paper. We have incorporated much of the comments and suggestions. Please let me briefly introduce the outlines of the revision.

We are fully conformed with the general comment that reorganization of the Main and Supplementary part is needed. According to the comments, we have transferred collaboration patterns’ part of the Supplementary file into the Main document. In addition, we have eliminated the parts that were duplicated in these documents. As suggested, we have shortened unnecessary extensive elaboration and have made it more straightforward and reader-friendly.

All figures are revised, in a line with the comments, with a frame being removed and the values (percentile group) on the y-axis being defined. It indeed appears much better now, thank you. Figures and Tables in the Supplementary file are now numbered differently than in the Main document.

Additional explanation how Average Journal Impact Factor Percentile is calculated has been provided. We are grateful for the comments that reference 21 (Zivkovic et al., 2017) was elaborating solely faculties, so we have made that more precise in the revised version.

We couldn’t agree more on the importance of incorporating the size of the institutions when examining its scientific performance (in particular a number of published papers; median avg\_JIF\_percentile is size-independent). The issue with conducting this analysis is the lack of reliably and publicly available data. Although the efforts are being introduced by researchers (reference 21) to use faculties web-site as the source of information, this data is approximate, to say at least. With a range of 31 faculties and 11 institutes, different approaches to the visibility of its staff can be observed when examining the institutions web sites. One of the major methodological issues, if using such data, is the fact that we can observe only current number of academic staff employed at the institution. There is no possibility to know the number of staff working at the certain institution throughout the observed period (each year, throughout the period 2009-2016). Also, PhD students contribute to the portion of institutions scientific output and they are not employed, thus we might end up with rather misleading results.

We clearly stated in our revised version of the paper that *it should be noted that institutions differ in the number of academic staff/researchers – it is thus likely that institutions with larger number of staff will produce more papers. This having said, the official data concerning the number of employed personnel is not publicly available and, in that sense, additional efforts by the University’ officials are needed to make the data visible (perhaps even obtained first). Publicly accessible data enables a new line in research with possibility to track the scientific performance both on individual (academic staff/researchers) and on institution’s level.*

In conclusion, we have stressed out that *one of the subjects that we would like to put forward in the future directions of the study is the efficiency and productivity measurement of institutions within university. Since currently the number of employed academic staff/researchers at faculties and institutes is not visible in University of Belgrade’ profile, it is not possible to provide a sound per researcher performance evaluation of faculties/institutes. In that sense, it is our genuine belief that with additional effort by the officials of the University of Belgrade a new set of indicators depicting the scientific performance of institutions per staff/researchers would immensely contribute to the University of Belgrade road towards the world-class research university.*

We would like to use this opportunity to show our appreciation for all the comments which reshaped our paper and considerably enhanced its quality. It is a privilege to be evaluated by your Journal. We sincerely hope we lived up to the reviewers’ expectations and managed to present you a revised version worth of publication.

Yours faithfully,

Ivan Pilčević, Veljko Jeremić and Dušan Vujošević