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Reviewer's report:

This is useful discussion of value pluralism in codes for the conduct of research. The authors describe the types of pluralism that can occur and illustrate them with reference to a set of codes selected for diversity (geography, age, origin). The paper makes important contribution to the literature. I have a few comments.

1. The authors explain why the codes were selected but they fail to include The Singapore Statement on Research Integrity, a well-know international research ethics code. They should include it or explain why it was not included.

2. The authors did not include codes from specific research professions (e.g. chemistry, physics, anthropology). There is also value-pluralism to be found here based on the different subject matters. The authors should discuss why these sorts of codes were not included or discuss the relationship between these codes and more general codes.

3. The authors should consider including and discussing the following reference as it is relevant to their work: Moffatt B. Scientific authorship, pluralism, and practice. Account Res. 2018;25(4):199-211.

4. The authors state that they are not trying to provide a foundation for the ethics codes but they should consider mentioning that some have tried to do this, such as: Resnik DB. The Ethics of Science, Routledge, 1998; Shamoo AE, Resnik DB, Responsible Conduct of Research, 3rd ed., Oxford, 2015; Shrader-Frechette KS, Ethics of Science, Rowman and Littlefield, 1994; De Winter J, Interests and the Epistemic Integrity of Science, Lexington Books, 2016.

5. The paper combines analytical and empirical methods. The authors should be clear about the role of the codes they examine the paper (I take it the codes are there to illustrate their conceptual points not as empirical evidence for them). If the authors are not clear about their use of codes in their argument a social scientist could fault them for failing to follow proper methods for doing qualitative research. For example, one could develop a classification system for performing a content analysis of different codes. The classification system (or framework) would be used to "code" the codes. For a paper that does this, see Resnik DB,
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