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Reviewer’s report:

An important study and the following suggestions are made;

- The term 'ethically annoying' implies a diminished responsibility to ethical considerations for practice and research by nurses, please reconsider the use of this term.

- P3 line 1, reduce the use of phrases such as 'it should be pointed out'. The authors just make the statements they need to make. The first sentence on this page could be deleted, it contributes little. Provide examples of ethically complex situations, but they may not be complex for all nurses, as ethical dilemmas are individual.

- P4 line 15 what are decencies in the education system?

- P4 line 21 remove (the) Iranian

- P5 Methods, how were nurses selected? or were they all invited?

- p5 line 13 10%

- The reason for selecting the setting of ICU is not clear, the reason for selecting the instruments is not clear.

- P7 Results- the demographic data could be reported with one decimal place. Was there only one dimension for perceived organizational support?

- p values are reported in lower case

- Conclusion- includes concepts not previously discussed such as ethical leadership style and friendly relations- the conclusion needs to be redrafted in light of the revised discussion and concepts related to the findings.

- Limitations of the study need to be discussed in the Discussion

- Discussion- the discussion of the results and location in the literature does not seem to have been fully immersed in the critical care/ICU literature, especially when there is such literature available. It seems of little values to make comparisons with the hotel industry (ref 45) general
nurses (44, 47) and emergency nurses (49) and mental health nurses (53) and not discuss the differences.

-P9 line 15, The conclusion drawn here should be modified, the relationship between paying attention to staff and moral and work conflicts was not tested. 'Attention' can be paid in many ways, and may or may not be related to support in this area.

P9 Line 20. should read. Also Cummings...

P10, Line 14...in the Iranian context, for example...

P11- line 18, after decision made to use the instrument, why on reflection, was it not the best instrument and why was this not clear before commencing the study?

P11 Mandatory repeat studies, implies that it is compulsory because the researchers did not make good design decisions for the first study. How could an ethics committee be certain of beneficence in follow up studies? Why is this statement related to original work referenced?

P12 the last line of the discussion needs rethinking- the paper has not described frequencies of confrontation.
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