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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. One of my main concerns is that it is not very clear why the authors wanted to develop a new measure in the first place. The aim and rationale for developing a new measurement tool needs to be addressed more clearly in the Introduction section. The authors mention the review by Valentine et al that includes 35 distinct measures. Why is it necessary to develop another one? I suppose there is a gap that is not covered by those measures, but this needs to be revealed to the reader. In this context it might also be interesting to explain why there is a need for assessment from different perspectives.

2. Please give more information item development. Was the item development grounded in theoretical work? Where patients and HCPs involved in the item development? What is the background of the experts? Was there a pre-testing of the items?

Minor Essential Revisions

3. Myself being a native German speaker, I have the feeling that the manuscript could benefit from editing by an English native speaker.

4. In the abstract, it only becomes clear in the Conclusion that the developed instrument measures interprofessional collaboration from both the patient’s and the HCP’s perspective.

5. Under Methods/Instruments, the authors define the construct “internal participation”. This term has already been introduced several times in the Introduction section. For the reader it might be easier to have the definition of the construct that you want to measure in the Introduction section only. In addition, please use a stringent terminology for the construct that you want to measure. On page 10 (line 6), the measured construct is named “team scale”. Is that the construct or the name of the scale?

6. Title and legend of Figure 1 are missing. Please add them to the revised manuscript.

7. Please provide a rationale why the underlying structure is hypothesized to be unidimensional.

8. Was the p value adjusted for multiple testing?

9. The authors correctly state that the local dependencies of items 1 and 3 and
items 5 and 6 indicate the existence of additional aspects that explain their associations. What aspects could that be? It would be interesting to discuss this.

10. The authors discuss that some items might have been difficult to assess by the patients as they were not directly involved in those processes. This leads me to a more general question: why is it necessary to assess “internal participation” from the patient’s perspective, who only sees part of what happens within the team? I believe that much of the interprofessional collaboration takes place when the patient is not present (e.g., in meetings, team rooms).

Discretionary Revisions

11. As a German researcher, I would appreciate a sentence that tells me how I could get hold of the German version if I wanted to use it (I suppose contact the authors?).

12. I wonder whether readers that are not familiar with the German health care system understand the terms somatic and psychosomatic rehabilitation clinics. This might need to be explained.

13. The description of the sample characteristics of the patients could be shortened, as the information is also included in the table.

14. The manuscript contains many tables. Is table 5 absolutely necessary or might it be enough to state the range of inter-item correlations?

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**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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