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Reviewer's report:

The present study examines residents' perceptions and behaviors related to unprofessional behavior. The revised paper is much improved. My specific concerns are written below:

1. In the background your 4th paragraph begins with the mentioning of the various papers on professionalism and then concludes that "the issue of how to operationalize the construct of "medical professionalism" for the purposes of physician training remains, therefore, a vexing one." Although I agree with this statement it is unclear how this conclusion rises from the above. Please explain.

2. I believe the explanation about not splitting the qualitative analysis by institution and gender should be in the paper. I must say from experience with such data, and even from the quantitative results that indicate a difference, I am not sure this decision was the right one. I do recommend splitting and seeing whether the issues, language used and emphasis differs.

3. I still think the qualitative analysis (in the methods and in the results) should be elaborated. For e.g. how the first two quotes were collapsed to represent respect.

4. You mention in the discussion that the two institutions have a different policy concerning pharmaceutical company interactions – perhaps this was already mentioned and discussed in their orientation to the institution, and by thus influenced their perception? Are your findings indicating this direction? If they are they actually could re-enforce your call for explicit mentioning of the institutional rules and beliefs concerning professionalism mentioned earlier.

5. I believe too much focus in the discussion is about the issue of pharmaceutical relationships – I suggest gathering this into one paragraph that includes all that needs to be said, to allow for a broader discussion about the other professionalism issues.

6. P. 12 last paragraph before limitations seems to connect to the paragraphs I referred to in the last former comments, and not necessarily under the title of the qualitative findings. I suggest connecting them.

7. Reference no. 31 is not the reference you mention in the text... the reference that addresses respect was: O. Karnieli-Miller, A. Taylor, A.H. Cottingham, T.S. Inui, R.T. Vu & R.M. Frankel. Exploring the Meaning of Respect in Medical Student Education: an Analysis of Student Narratives. Journal of General Internal Medicine, Vol. 25(12), pp. 1309-1314, 2010. Though both references address issues related to professionalism and respect – the content you discuss was in
the paper mentioned above. Please check all references for accuracy and revise this and others as necessary.
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Good luck and I look forward to reading the next papers from this data.
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