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Reviewer's report:

Line 78-81 Please elaborate 'below norm' and provide the benchmark for categorizing '…more than 35%....not exceeding 50%' as 'below norm'
Line 82 'however' is wrongly used as conjunction between the statements
Line 83-85 the statements before and after 'yet' are not appropriately matched
Line 88-89 Rephrase '…and hence........are scarce'
Line 148 ethnic diversity was not mentioned in sample description
Line 150 Explain 'independent monitor'
Line 181 Replace 'study physicians' with 'respondents' or 'participants'
Line 187-189 Provide the actual figures (percentage for instance) for every level (eg. 'almost half' or 'relatively high') and the reference point of the comparative level (eg. 'relatively high' in comparison to what)
Line 194 Add 'with' before 'prior....'
Line 196-197 Rephrase 'Regarding.....(p=0000)'
Line 245-249 Provide the actual figures (percentage for instance) for every level (eg. 'almost half' or 'two thirds' or 'most')
Line 247 Explain 'misrepresentation' in the context of research ethic
Line 248-251 Rephrase 'When asked......scientific misconduct'. The statement is very confusing.
Line 258 Replace or rephrase 'more moral' term to a more suitable term
Line 260 Explain further 'rules over'
Line 281 'awareness' and 'perception' are missing in the aims of the study
Line 284-285 Rephrase 'is low....prior research experience'. The statement is very confusing.
Line 291 Rephrase 'only study has evaluated'
Line 296-297 Explain the term 'however' in comparing the percentage of concern and awareness
Line 298 Replace 'yet' with more suitable conjunction
Line 316 Put '51%' into bracket

The conclusion did not cater the main subjects of the study which is the awareness, knowledge, attitudes and perception of researcher towards research ethics and scientific misconduct instead focusing on the impacts of research ethics training and the function and role of research ethics committee, which were not highlighted in the study. The relationships between the awareness, knowledge and attitudes of the respondents towards research ethics and scientific misconduct were not sufficiently elaborated in the findings and discussions, and also were left out in the conclusion. The conclusion should be drawn out from the findings and discussion and presented in such structure.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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