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Reviewer's report:

Reviewer comments: Dr Elizabeth Wager
This is an important study of reviewer perceptions on research integrity in Nigeria.
The response rate is very impressive (89%) and the results are interesting not only because they are different from those found in many Western countries (eg lack of pressure from sponsors and lack of authorship disputes), but of themselves, since a broader understanding of research integrity in all regions is important. Most importantly, this survey also reveals a very high level of perceived misconduct (as the authors note this is much higher than previously published studies).
The discussion is excellent and puts the results nicely into context.
The paper is clearly written and does not require language editing (unlike so many I see!)

Statistical query
I am not an expert in statistics, but I thought the Fisher exact test was only suitable for very small samples (<5) so I was surprised to see that it was used for this study (N=133). Also, it is used for categorical data (usually 2x2 contingency tables) and I was not sure that data from Likert scales should be treated in this way. I suggest you get this point clarified by a statistician.

Minor corrections
p3, line 4, the usual phrase is ‘responsible’ (rather than credible) conduct of research
p3, line 6, the correct title of the ORI is the Office OF (not for) Research Integrity

Minor revisions (not for publication)
On two occasions (p6) the term ‘majority’ is used without an article (‘Majority of the researchers’ or ‘Majority ... disagreed’) I suggest that standard English would be to use a definite article (ie ‘The majority of researchers’, or ‘The majority disagreed’)
p7, 1st line under title, should be ‘had occurred’
Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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