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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors,

Thank you for your efforts in preparing the manuscript. Below please find my comments:

Background
- It is generally too long. It could be made shorter and sending the same message.
- Page 3, Line 47-54: the statement needs a reference(s).
- 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".
- 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.

Methods
- There is no mention of the setting/location where the study took place.
- Page 6, line 7: Please be specific about the number of students attending the medical faculty. You stated "approximately 575".
- 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.
- 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?)
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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
- The ethical approval and students' consent should be mentioned in Methods.

Results
- Page 7, line 41: Please mention the response rate.
- 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, %).
- 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?
- 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.
- Please the tables need to be restructured to properly represent what was done.

Discussion.
I could not find any discussion of the limitations of the study.

Conclusions.
Too long. Please consider making it shorter.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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