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Reviewer’s report:

A strong contribution to the literature. There are places where it is a bit confusing which institutional response is being discussed, and it took me time to disentangle the saga. Important findings include the lack of correction to the literature and the failure to assess the majority of publications about which concerns were raised. This pattern has been seen elsewhere and is critical to address. That two of the institutions started additional investigations after you raised questions is both positive and disheartening that this step was necessary.

It would be helpful for you to address a bit more clearly what elements of integrity of the literature you believe were not addressed because of the perceived focus on research misconduct. It can be partially inferred from the tables, and clarifying that point would make this a stronger paper. The conclusion seems entirely plausible to me, and isn't fully explained.

I would like to see an expanded discussion of this work and more detail, as well as places that you believe the checklist items are ambiguous and could be clarified. Perhaps a user's guide would be a useful contribution to develop?
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