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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor and reviewers,

On behalf of all authors I would like to thank you for your beneficial comments. All of your valuable suggestions and corrections have improved our work.

We tried our best to correct/answer all of your comments.

Editor’s comments:
1. please follow the STROBE reporting guidelines for cross-sectional studies in Abstract and in the manuscript itself. In both cases, mention the study design, date, location, university and stats methods.

   Answer: We’ve followed the STROBE statement and we changed the title as “The Impact of Gender and Academic Achievement about the Violation of Academic Integrity for Medical Faculty Students, a descriptive cross-sectional survey study”. We’ve mentioned the date, location, university and statistical methods in both manuscript and abstract. All corrections were stated in the corrected version of the manuscript.

2. English language revision is needed for the entire paper.

   Answer: We’ve sent the manuscript to a Native English speaker for proof reading through a proof reading service (www.proof-reading-service.com).

3. Describe in Methods how the internal consistency reported in Results was assessed.

   Answer: The reference 14 were stated the internal consistency and test–retest reliability coefficient of the scale and stated in the method section of manuscript as “The Cronbach alpha internal consistency reliability coefficient of the whole scale was reported as 0.90, and the internal consistency reliability coefficients of the subscales were reported as 0.71, 0.821, 0.785 and 0.766 for the first factor to the fourth factor [14]. The test–retest reliability coefficient obtained as a result of applying the scale
twice to a group of 20 people at 15-day intervals was reported as 0.88 [14].”

For our study’s internal consistency were also calculated for both whole scale and subscales and mentioned in results section.

4. Describe the sampling strategy in Methods.
   Answer: The method section has been revised.

5. Report the exact p value in table 1.
   Answer: The all tables of the study were reorganized and checked, new tables and 3 figures were added to the revised manuscript.

6. Statistical revision is needed: why is there no pairwise comparison after the significant ANOVA in 4?
   Answer: The all tables of the study were reorganized and checked, new tables and 3 figures were added to the revised manuscript.

7. is there adjustment for multiple testing? why was not multivariable analysis used to assess the relationship of the outcome variable to gender and academic achievement?
   Answer: 2x3 Factorial ANOVA table between variable was made. Extra tables and figures were added to the manuscript.

Reviewer 1’s comments:
On behalf of all authors I would like to thank you for your beneficial comments. All of your valuable suggestions and corrections have improved our work.
We tried our best to correct/answer all of your comments.
1. We’ve sent the manuscript to a Native English speaker for proof reading through a proof reading service (www.proof-reading-service.com).
2. The manuscript has been shortened with the contribution of all authors.
3. All authors checked the statistical analysis and tried their best to improve it (all changes in the manuscript are mentioned).

Reviewer 2’s comments:
Background
1. - It is generally too long. It could be made shorter and sending the same message.
   Answer: The manuscript has been shortened with the contribution of all authors.
2 - Page 3, Line 47-54: the statement needs a reference(s).
   Answer: This section has been removed from the article.
3 - Page 4, line 4 and 5: "Furthermore, there are studies presenting that cheating attitude of students changes in a positive way...". I think the phrasing, as such, is a bit confusing. I would be easier to understand if rephrased to focus on "having less cheating".
   Answer: This section has been removed from the article.
4 - Page 5, lines 45-52: the aim is too long, unfocused, and confusing. please rephrase. You may also break it down into two or more if needed.
   Answer: This section of the manuscript has been shortened with the contribution of all authors.

Methods
- There is no mention of the setting/location where the study took place.
   Answer: The setting/location has been mentioned in the manuscript and method section has been revised.
- Page 6, line 7: Please be specific about the number of students attending the medical faculty. You stated "approximately 575".
   Answer: The exact number were 572, stated in the manuscript and method section has been revised.
- Page 6, lines 10-22: you started by mentioning that the participants were asked to answer "the following questions" then in line 22 you mentioned/described the tool that was used in the study. I believe you need to start off by describing the main tool that was used then mentioned an additional information that was gathered.

  Answer: The method section has been revised.

- In line 17, you mentioned that the students were "asked to make self-assessment about their academic achievements level". Please explain how they were expected to do this (how did they do it?)

  Answer: The method section has been revised.

- In addition, in line 17, you mentioned "they were expected to make categorization...". This is not clear as who will do this categorization. Please rephrase this who section to be more logical and understandable.

  Answer: The method section has been revised.

- Page 6, line 51: you mentioned "A total of 9 negative and 13 positive items were assessed." Please rephrase to indicate that the ADS has a total of 9 negative and 13 positive statements.

  Answer: The method section has been revised.

- Page 7, lines 1 -12: I would rather use the word "set" or "considered" instead of "accepted" unless this is the word used by the creators of the tool mentioned in reference 20.

  Answer: "Considered" was used instead of wording "accepted".

- Page 7, lines 12 - 17: you mentioned "These values were re-assessed by dividing the students into groups based on their gender, grade, average class level and on whether they have read the directive or not, to show whether there was difference among the groups." It is not clear what was exactly done. Please describe in more specific/ measurable terms.

  Answer: The method section has been revised.

- Generally, It is not clear 1) how the students were invited to participate, 2) what format was used (electronic or paper-based), 3) who administered the questionnaire, 4) how much time was given to the students to answer (for example, a week or two...), 5) if reminders were sent or not

  Answer: The population of the study consisted of 572 undergraduate students who were attending courses in the Faculty of Medicine at Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University. A total of 271 students (response rate: 47.3%) participated voluntarily in the descriptive cross-sectional survey in response to verbal invitations given in lecture breaks between the months of April and June 2018. The 259 subjects who completed the entire survey were included in the study. The only exclusion criterion in this study was not to have completed the descriptive data questions completely.

- The ethical approval and students' consent should be mentioned in Methods.

  Answer: The sentence “The study were approved by the Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Human Research Ethics Committee (approve date/ number : 2018 / 43)” has been added to the methods section.

Results

- Page 7, line 41: Please mention the response rate.

  Answer: Response rate were added to the method section.

- Table 1: the table is confusing. there is male but no female. Then, What is toplam? Also, next to male, you need to add (n, %).

  Answer: The all tables of the study were reorganized and checked, new tables and 3 figures were added to the revised manuscript.

- Table 2: the title of the table does not describe what is mentioned in the text Page 7, line 56 and on. Also, what does the last raw represent?

  Answer: The all tables of the study were reorganized and checked, new tables and 3 figures were added to the revised manuscript.

- Table 3: the title is not clear at all and does not describe what is mentioned in the text Page 8, line 10 - 22. In addition, it is not clear to me what the last raw is about.

  Answer: The all tables of the study were reorganized and checked, new tables and 3 figures were added to the revised manuscript.
were added to the revised manuscript.
- Please the tables need to be restructured to properly represent what was done.
  Answer: The all tables of the study were reorganized and checked, new tables and 3 figures were added to the revised manuscript.

Discussion.
I could not find any discussion of the limitations of the study.
  Answer: The limitation of the study section has been added to the manuscript.

Conclusions.
Too long. Please consider making it shorter.
  Answer: All sections have been tried to be shortened.