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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Dr Kowalczuk,

Thank you for your kind words and possibility to ensure final corrections. I have inserted the comment from Reviewer #3 below, followed by our reply and the suggested new passage between quotation marks (“…”).

Reviewer #3: Thank you for the careful revision of the manuscript. I find it much easier to understand the purpose, approach, and findings in this version of the paper.

I have one minor comment, the paper now states the following: "The data described here concern perceptions of research misbehaviours and thus extend the previous findings by describing which research misbehaviours impact the research climate and go further by exploring this in a qualitative focus group study."
This statement might need a slight tweak to make it accurate. The phrase "by describing which research misbehaviours impact the research climate" sounds like you will test research questions involving climate as a variable in this paper. But, I believe that you do not in this paper. I think that you are suggesting that the researchers' perceptions might help explain their views of the climate (perhaps reported elsewhere). But, you did not explicitly test the associations of their views to climate in a quantitative fashion in this paper?

It have misunderstood the statement, I am open to it staying as is, but suggest giving it a quick evaluation.

Response: Thank you for your thorough reading and suggestion. You are right that the current phrasing suggests a type of assessment that is beyond the scope of this paper. A more concise description of how the different parts of our study hang together would be:

“The data described here extend our previous findings (17) by identifying the research misbehaviours that are perceived to impact the research climate most.”

Thank you again for the rigorous review. Should our response provoke any questions, please do not hesitate to get in touch.

Also on behalf of my co-authors,

Yours sincerely,

Tamarinde Haven