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Reviewer 3:

Thank you for the review of my article ‘Does growing up with a physician influence the ethics of medical students’ relationships with the pharmaceutical industry? The cases of the US and Poland’.

1. The major concern with the statistical methods is the insufficient detail provided on the study design, sampling frame and sampling methods. Without detail on study design, methods and response rate, it is very difficult to assess the generalisation and validity of the results presented. - What was the study design? Was the questionnaire given to every student enrolled in each of the classes during the study period? Was it mandatory? - What was the response rate? Please break it down by year of study and country/university. - Please include all other relevant details of study design and sampling strategy.

Response: The whole method section has been rewritten. The research referred to in the article is part of a larger study, the methodology of which was previously described in great detail in an book published in the Polish language. However, I acknowledge that there was not enough methodological detail in the previous version of the current article and have tried to answer all the questions posed in the reviewer’s comments above. If any additional explanation is needed please do not hesitate to ask me for it.

2. Please detail the breakdown of the questions. The methods state there were 8 + 4 questions; but later says that two of the main questions were composed of 20 statements and then that a factor analysis was done (only?) on these two questions, which then leads to 5 indexes. I am not clear on a) what kind of factor analysis and b) what questions or statements went into that procedure. How were statements processed prior to the factor analysis? Only the results of
three indexes are reported (table 1: reciprocity; table 2: doctors rights; table 3: trust) - where/what are the other two indexes? - Near the end of the methods (line 34)

Response: I have made the data set publically available by placing the questionnaire, the whole database and the Polish language publication that describes the methodology of the larger project of which the present article is part on the Internet. These materials are available on figshare (DOI: https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.5067364.v1).

I have added a new section – ‘The origin of the indexes’. This provides a brief description of the factor analytic processes (or more accurately principal components analysis processes) used to create the indexes and provides information about the other indexes and statements from Q1 and Q6 which were involved in the analysis. If you do not feel that this information is necessary in the article I can append it as additional material and leave only the first paragraph in the manuscript.

3. Post-stratification weights were applied. Please detail the elements that went into the calculation of these weights. - The statistical methods need to be presented in greater detail

Response. The weights have been added - please look Table 2.

4. Lines 43-54 belong in the Methods.

Response: I have made this change.

5. Exact p-values and reporting of p-values for all significant and not significant results is preferred.

Response: I have added exact p-values and p-values for non-significant results under the tables.

I hope that these changes are acceptable. If you have any further comments I would be happy to address them.

Thank you for all comments!