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Reviewer’s report:

I would say that all the comments are minor essential revisions:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
The title of the paper is a statement rather than a question but it covers the content of the paper and indicates to the reader what the paper is about.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
The methods are well described but are highly academic and if the intention of the paper is to assist clinical teams in deciding whether to use the CPSET tool I would suggest that more information is needed on the measurement mechanisms that are used. For example “The Cronbach’s alpha results in this study are higher than in the original study of Vanhaecht et al.” I would suspect that many of my clinical colleagues would be unfamiliar with the Cronbach alpha results.

3. Are the data sound?
The data looks sound to me

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Yes, the references are clearly identified and the manuscript generally is laid out in a standard format. There are some issues with language where I thought there may be a question over what the authors were actually trying to convey. There could be more clarity about where the tables are located, such as page numbers.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Yes, as stated I am slightly concerned that the paper is very academic and may be more than the average clinician would manage to understand but if the paper is intended for academics then I am sure it has merit.
The Discussion section on page 9 has some confusing elements-it stated that the alpha results are higher than Vanhaecht’s study but do not go on to discuss the implications of this.
They say that there is less variance within teams than within hospitals and then appear to suggest that this is because teams are composed of people with
different perceptions of care—but this would imply that teams would not show less variance but more. I wonder if they are actually trying to say that different teams would have different perceptions of care? I would look closely at the whole paragraph to see if you can make it clearer for the reader.

I suspect that the problem here is one of language /translation and would encourage the authors to review this aspect of the work.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Yes, the limitations are clearly laid out and the authors also site mechanisms to improve on the limitations by repeating the study in different countries and they show that this is already beginning to happen.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes they reference the previous work.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes, although as stated I think this a highly academic paper.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
There are a number of issues with language where I was unclear as to the meaning of the authors
e.g. Discussion-page 9 – A One reason can could be that teams are composed by of different disciplines or , professions which with each of them have different perception about the organization of care. I think this is what the authors were trying to say

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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