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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor and Reviewers,

On behalf of all authors I would like to thank the editor and reviewers for their valuable comments and interest in our paper.

Editorial Comments:
1. In addition to responding to the reviewers' comments, pls report regression coefficients and confidence interval of the regression analysis in table 6 and comment on them in results text.
   • Regression coefficients and coefficient intervals are reported in table 6. In the result section it is mentioned.
2. The statement in Abstract/ Results should be corrected to reflect the regression in Table 6 and so should Abstract/ Conclusion and Conclusion at the end of the paper. The differences are not significant.
   • The statements in all abstract/ results and conclusions are corrected by the reflect of regressions in Table 6.
   • All values in the tables are rechecked and some changes are made. All changes were mentioned in the tracked version of the table document.

Reviewer reports:
Asim Al-Ansari (Reviewer 2): Dear authors thank you for responding to the comments.
1. However, I do believe that the following statement (A total of 271 students (response rate: 47.3%) should be moved from the Methods section to the Results section.

Thank you
• The sentence is moved the Method section.

Nourhan Aly (Reviewer 4):
1. **Introduction**: the statement of the problem should have been supported with more "recent" studies. There is plenty of citable literature in this topic.
   - Recent studies were added in the reference section.

2. The authors mentioned a study in Zagreb, I think you should mention that Zagreb is a city in Croatia. Also this study focuses only on "plagiarism". I agree that it is an important dimension in determining the academic dishonesty, but I believe there are many other references that include other aspects of academic dishonesty and can be better used
   - Country was added

3. There are 2 studies conducted in "Turkey" about academic dishonesty among health science schools students:
   - (b) [https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21646326](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21646326). They can be very useful to include.
   - Two studies were added in the reference section.

4. **Methods**: "No sampling method was used". I think this statement should be replaced by "A non-random sampling method was used where participants volunteered..."
   - The sentence was removed and stated in the previous sentence as: “Students participated voluntarily with a non-random sampling method in the descriptive cross-sectional survey in response to verbal invitations given in lecture breaks between the months of April and June 2018.”

5. **Methods**: The authors mentioned that [Academic achievement was measured by the answer to the question "What is your academic achievement level?"]]. I believe that this is a defect in the methodology, because students may tend to report a higher academic achievement level.
   - “Although it seems that the students' self-classification of academic levels might have created a defect on the methodology of the study, it was considered to be beneficial in terms of protecting the personal information of the students. It was thought that students could provide more objective information to the scale in this way.”

6. **Table 1**: the reported p value of the last variable "Have you read the Student Disciplinary Regulation code for Higher Education Institutions?" is p=665. I think this needs to be rechecked.
   - All values in tables were rechecked and some changes are made. Changes are mentioned in the “tracked” version of the manuscript.

7. **References**: More recent references need to be included.
   - Recent studies were added in the reference section.

8. Reference number 20, the year is placed after the authors.
   - It is corrected.