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Reviewer's report:

This paper seems to be the background/literature survey for an empirical study that the authors note is lacking. However, it is not itself an empirical study, rendering the paper a "call to action." Whether the Journal elects to publish it will depend on whether it publishes such papers.

In the main, the paper is well-written and makes sensible observations. However, I do wonder whether the phenomenon the authors point to (i.e., a lack of published studies of research misconduct among physicians in the UK) is partly mistaken. In the US context with which I'm familiar, many of the published studies of misconduct/QRPs include *both* physician and non-physician scientists. I don't know whether that's the case in the UK, but if so, it means there is more data on the topic of physician misconduct than one would find looking only for papers on physician misconduct.

In the US, it's also the case that in many ways institutions with medical schools lead the way in discussing research ethics training, partly because so many of the worst episodes of misconduct have come from physician researchers, and because the risks and costs are so high when studies involve human health. So, the claims in this paper about medical schools not providing sufficient ethics training strike me as false in the US context, but I lack the ability to evaluate them in the UK context, recognizing the very different health care systems in each country.

A quick point: the reference to Liang, Mackey and Lovett is slightly wrong; the school is the University of California, San Diego School of Medicine/UCSD School of Medicine. ("University of California, San Diego" is the name of the institution.)
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