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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors!

When I wrote the review I converted your PDF to word-text and then wrote all my comments direct in the text enabling for you to see exactly where the comment were relevant. When finishing the review I learned that the comments should be written here. However, due to time-constraints I will send you the comments as an attachment. Here are some overall comments:

1) Thank You for contributing to the field of ethics support, it is a very important research context.

2) The results-section could be re-structured and shortened in order to make it more explicit, without repetitions (please see the comments in the attachment)

3) The discussion-section is incomplete and not related to your extensive work (please see the comments in the attachment)

4) The conclusion is written as a summary and I as a reader would like to know about the conclusions that you draw from your empirical data, not to repeat the results (please see the comments in the attachment).

5) Good luck with your revisions!

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

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?  
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

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.

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

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/). 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.
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