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Reviewer's report:

In response to the authors' revisions.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. I appreciate that you took my suggestion to change the title of the study. I should have been clearer in my earlier comments, that I think the paper would be greatly enhanced if you shifted, not just the title, but the entire focus of the paper to the relationships between resident’s professionalism ratings and their participation in those behaviors. Then make the differences between gender and institution of secondary importance in the paper. As it stands, right now, the title and the major focus of the paper are not in alignment. Just changing the title is not enough to address the issue that your most interesting finding is the fact that residents participate in the behavior that they identify as unprofessional, you need to actually make it more central in the way you frame your study. At the very least, the title and the focus should be aligned, so if you choose not to change the focus in the body of the paper, you should go back to your previous title.

2. Thank you for addressing this point. I still think you could very quickly run a Cronbach alpha on the data you collected for this study and add a sentence. It would take just a few minutes to run the analysis in SPSS and write up a sentence. “For the current study, the instrument had excellent/acceptable/marginal/poor reliability; Cronbach alpha was .XX.” With 46 items and 375 participants, I imagine you’ll have a good Cronbach alpha and it would add some nice reliability to your study.

3. I’m satisfied with the statement that you added to the limitations section.

4. I’m satisfied with the authors’ response to my questions about the Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel statistic.

5. I’m satisfied with the authors’ response.

6. Thank you for adding the comments; I think they nicely enhance this section of the paper.

7. I’m satisfied with the authors’ response.

8. I’m satisfied with the authors’ response.

Minor Essential Revisions – Thank you for addressing. After re-reading, I couldn’t find “voluntary” listed twice either. I apologize; I must have misread the paper the
first time around.
Discretionary Revisions – Thank you for addressing.
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