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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting and well-written discussion of research misconduct in the medical profession in England. The authors discuss and problem and give some plausible explanations. Though I found the article interesting I am not sure that it advances the literature on this topic very much. The authors cast a very wide net and cover a lot of issues but more might be gained by focusing on a particular one, such as the role of medical societies in investigating, deterring, and preventing research misconduct. What role, should they play, over and above institutions (such as academic medical centers)? Should doctors who commit misconduct faced punishment by medical boards? Why or why not? Why might boards be reluctant to punish doctors for research misconduct? Do they have the authority they need to investigate misconduct?

Some minor points.

The Andrew Wakefield case is not included in this article; it should be discussed.

The paper has a lot of quotes, some of which are not well explained or tied in. Quotes should be reduced.

Quality of written English

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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