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Reviewer's report:

The aim of the study is to develop and psychometrically test a “team scale” for interprofessional cooperation. The scale assesses “team quality” from the perspective of heath care professionals as well as patient (two different versions).

The main finding is, that the instrument psychometrically works well and can now be used for its purpose.

The paper is well written and clear, I have only some smaller comments.

General comments
Two things should be made clearer:

1. New instrument: The authors state that there is no German instrument up to now, that however there are English tools. Why did they decide to develop a new instrument instead of translating / adapting an existing one. And: do the contents of the new German instrument differ from the older ones in other languages?

2. Treatment of missings is unclear; what did you do:
   a) exclusion of cases with missings (complete data only),
   b) No scale value if > 1 missing (some missings tolerable),
   c) multiple imputation of missings,
   d) different things with the two datasets?

Please check your sentences carefully. Some of them are difficult to understand.

Please check the tense. Sometimes you mix present tense and past tense in the same chapter.

Concrete single points:
Table 1: please put items in same order as you address them on the text or viceversa.

Table 4, 5, 8; Figure 2: please add (short) labels for the items number 1-6

Figure 2: Please state / explain what the coefficients (2 per item) in figure stand for

Several times: Construct validation? Is construct validity?

Interpretation of Cronbach’s alpha: I know >0.7 good and > 0.9 probable redundancy (”too high”)

Conclusion of abstract: suggestion: “… the scales’ psychometric properties”

P4:
[1-4]
improvement of
health economic costs – health costs?
Baldwin applied – used the term?
Treatment strategy – treatment

P5:
Maybe add concepts OPTION (Elwyn) and MAPPIN’SDM (Kasper) also for more than one group
instrument in Germany – instrument in German
P6:
Check meaning of 1. sentence please
>18 - >= 18?

P7:
Why six items? Six aspects – six items?
Same order of items as in table 1 please
Middle paragraph: please add sth like: The scale value was calculated as the mean of the six items and transposed on a scale from 0 – 100.
Validation – validity

P8:
See remark on thresholds of Cronbach’s alpha above
Stat: see remark on treatment of missings above
Prior to data entry – prior to analysis?

P9:
… for the description…. Please check if this part can be deleted or make it more clear.

P10 (or discussion)
Please add some testing of representativity or state why it is not possible. At least it should be possible to check this according to age and gender for the staff group.

P11
Middle section: please state that you are talking about the items of the team scale here.
Please give short labels too, when you give numbers of items
0-4 should be 1-4
factor analysis: explorative here?

P12
Item 5 … is concerned
Explains – fits?
Threshold – thresholds

P13
Construct validity: to short. Please give a short summary of the findings in table 9 in the text containing also the names of the items

P14
Teamwork (two times [4]) Please connect the 2 sentences to make clear that the 3 points are following.

Last paragraph: it is unclear if it were “no answer” or your category “cannot judge”. This makes a diff. for the quality of the instrument, the latter would be ok, the first a problem (i.e. misleading question, non understandable question))

P16
Add that instrument should be tested if it can assess pre-post changes

Good luck!

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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