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Reviewer's report:

Interesting topic to write and particularly, useful information to the field of research integrity and ethics. However, I do have some queries to make and I hope the author can make justify it & make some changes accordingly.

Introduction

Pg3/L21: You mentioned "developed recommendation and reflections on research integrity..."

- I want to know, what do you mean with 'reflection on research integrity' and 'developed recommendation' such as what? It is not so clear what do you mean with this part of the OFIS's objective. Do elaborate as I believe reader will want to know.

Pg3/L29: You wrote, "...and observe the practice of senior researchers..".

- What do they observed? Senior researchers engage in QRPs? Is that what this mean? Who observed it?

Pg3/L38: You wrote "...There is no national registry of the cases of misconduct..".

- Are you saying that there is no National Registry in France that specific to cases of research misconduct or are you saying that such registry exist but so far no research misconduct cases are reported? You need to make this clear because it a bit confusing.
Methodology

This section is clear & good.

Results

Pg4/L36: You wrote.."58 of them are active RIOs while 2 of them occupied fulltime RIOs position.."

- What are the status of the other 36 RIOs?

- Are you saying that these 58 RIOs are from the 68 male RIOs or from the total of 96 identify RIOs?

Pg4/L38: ".means of 96 RIOs (6 missing data).."

- That will make 97 RIOs, is it 96 or 97 RIOs?

Discussion

Pg4/L52 - Pg 5/L4: comparison findings with the UK

- Why UK? Normally we compare with country that show a positive progress but not equally slow progress?

- If you want to highlight that implementation of research integrity authorities/unit/policies/actions are usually taking a long time for example in the UK, so it is not surprising that the progress is also slow in France, it be better if you highlight some of the reasons that it is slowly progressing in the UK and whether France is facing the same hindrance? Because just compare both and say that it is normal that it takes time to implement something like RIOs, it reflects that you do not really read your literature review thoroughly. I believe UK & France scenario may posed different challenges when implementing RIOs.

Pg5/L7-8: "France does not have an institution similar to the US ORI, which investigate and make decision."

- But you mentioned earlier of Inserm, that have power to investigate research misconduct. How is Inserm different that ORI? If there is differences, you need to provide explanation what Inserm
can do and cannot do or different between Inserm & ORI since you already mentioned it in the earlier page.

Pg5/L13: "The US does not have an organization equivalent to the OFIS".

- Are you sure? Because ORI does have a division of education and integrity which if you read clearly, may have similar objectives as OFIS. ORI also conduct RCR training for their RIO. Do read

Pg5/L29-32: "because the science of 2019..1980"

- I suggest that you rephrase this to.. "The practices of scientific research ..." Perhaps?

Pg5/L31-32: ".., is it possible..with?"

- It is not really good to end a sentence of paragraph with a question unless you provide answers for the question. I suggest you rephrase the question to a statement.

- For this issue (the task & training of RIOs) I suggest you can read on RCR instruction.

Pg5/L35-39

- Is this a suggestion (L35-36) and is this what currently happening or the situation now (L36-39)? Or you merely stating a reason why the specification for RIUs for the policies is important?

Pg5/L39-40:"The system. Necessary"

- I suggest this sentence to be place in Conclusion or consider removing it all together.

Conclusion

- Again do not end a sentence with a question.

- I am wondering why is this question keep on appearing, "..is it possible for early career researcher to easily accept that a senior can investigate practices that she/he has never experience with?" (pg5/l53-55), again previously at pg3/L32-34, again it was mentioned in pg5/L29-32.
-why do I ask this, it is because 1) If this is the research question, then the objective do not answer this question, which it suppose to, 2)What does RI development & RIOs profile has anything to do with the credibility to be RIOs? If you want to know this require an investigation, 3) if this is the research question, then where is the answer? The result only showed general data on the RIOs and do not highlight anything regarding the details of their experience, 4) There are no references include in this articles that touches on the criteria of RIOs, 5) therefore, if the author do not wish to provide the answer for this question or it is not included in this part of the research (probably author is planning to do it on the next research), please remove the question from the article. Author can put in in recommendation though.
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