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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to re-review the revised version of the manuscript.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The manuscript in its present form is still very long. I understand that the authors want to report what they did in detail, which is legitimate. Also, I understand that an online journal might have fewer problems publishing such a long article. However, as a reader I find some of the information overwhelming and I think that shortening would increase comprehensibility a lot.

2. It is not clear how the rating of psychometric properties of existing measures was operationalized (Table 1). What did the authors consider “poor”, “doubtful” or “adequate”. This seems to be similar to the COSMIN rating scale or the quality criteria developed by Terwee et al.

Minor Essential Revisions

3. The authors did add a rationale why a new measure is needed; however this is still quite basic. It might be helpful to formulate the “five principles” differently: not at the end of the Introduction after the aims, which I find unusual, but rather as gaps / issues to consider when developing new measures. This might help improve the rationale why the authors developed the new measure.

Discretionary Revisions

4. Introduction, page 6, second paragraph, second sentence: How can “involvement in shared decision making” influence the optimal decision making style?

5. Please check the reference list carefully, e.g. reference 20 is the same than reference 60.
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