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Reviewer’s report:

There is much that has improved in this revision. The reviewers' suggestions appear to have been taken literally and changes made. Some misplacement of material remains, and the results section could use substantial strengthening. Copy-editing would be very helpful. Details below:

Abstract: OK, lines 7-9 still unclear as to what how ethics is understood here but these and other revisions are helpful. Needs minor copy-editing.

Background: find a substitute word for "unprecedented" (don't use twice in rapid succession). Suggestion: Line 36 "...that is increasingly complex."

Lines 56-80 - this material is helpful.

Line 71-75, discusses medical school curriculum - this is a new topic, and needs a new paragraph if it is to be included at all (it does not add much substance to the discussion - in my view it could be deleted.). Line 75-80 belong in the preceding paragraph.

Lines 259-262 may also belong in the background section - move from discussion.

Methods: This section is much better with the revisions.

Line 105, the description of the survey, needs a new paragraph. Add the number and type of questions in each section. Copy edit.

Results: This is the weakest section. While the tables are helpful, this discussion needs narrative explanations of what data in the tables represent.

Clarify again that these are medical students in a medical school. Go through the data by sections. Lines 134-136 = demographic data (is this all you have?).

Lines 136-144 discusses Part two of the survey. These questions were about "views on ethics education and ethical dilemmas." Describe the kinds of questions asked and how they were answered.

Lines 144-149 summarize Part 3 (I think, it is not clear)
Lines 149-152 summarize part 4. (I think)

For each of the above sections, restate how many and what kinds of questions were being asked, and the main themes represented in responses. The weakness of this section as is prevent me from recommending publication until it is clarified and developed.

Discussion: Generally good material

Lines 163-165 would also be better placed in the Background section.

Line 171-174 belongs in the Results section. Doesn't make any sense here - we have not heard about this "State Chapter" etc.

Lines 176-188 is also background information.

Lines 15/223-23/227 - these observations call for some mention of how professionalism and ethics can overlap, perhaps mention this also in the Introduction section.

This is a good study and deserves publication, however attention to terms, clarification of results, and organization are still not quite what they need to be. I recommend an editor to help with writing and organizations if that is possible.

Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

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

Yes

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

Unable to assess

**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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published

**Declaration of competing interests**
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license ([http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal.