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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

While the research has potential to provide useful insights in the field, the structure of the paper as written leaves gaps in the knowledge apparently gained from the research team.

1. The paucity of information and explanation within the results section of the paper is a major detraction from the potential benefits of the research. It appears that at least the first major paragraph in the discussion section should be woven into the results section. However, even with this change, this section of the paper needs more substantial work.

2. While establishing the cutoff levels is helpful, the authors provide little information about why the information is important or how researchers or organizations would use such a table when exploring the impact of the CPSET score of care processes within their organization. For example, the authors state in the conclusion that “The cutoff scores… support healthcare managers in ranking their teams searching for differences… or to analyze the needs of teams...” While this may be true, it is unclear how or why healthcare managers would or should care about using the cutoff scores. More information is needed about why this is important information for the overall research community.

3. It is not clear with the authors used Kruskal Wallis or Mann-Whitney test to explore the differences by gender, age and profession. With the large sample size, it seems like there are more appropriate tests that could be performed.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Information about the level of organizational care processes, if collected, would be a useful addition to the paper as it would first present more detailed information about the context in which the survey was completed and second would potentially allow for the exploration of differences between care processes and staff responses on the CPSET.

2. The authors indicate that they received responses from 114 organizations and 283 teams. This would imply that responses were received from multiple teams in the same organization. If so, clarifications regarding this information would be an asset to the paper and may allow for exploration of differences between teams within the same organization.

3. Descriptive statistics on differences by type of facility where psychiatric and
specialized hospitals are combined as well as differences by country would be a beneficial addition to the paper.

4. Exploring some of the same statistics by sub-groups (e.g., country or type of hospital) would strengthen the paper.

5. The structure of Table 3 is very hard to read. Restructuring it might make it easier for the readers to understand the results.
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