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General

-------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

The subject of this article is interesting and very relevant; there is little research on the management of teams and collaboration. The article needs some major revisions but because of the interest of the subject, I encourage the author to resubmit. The major pitfalls of the article can be corrected with some rewriting, it is not insurmountable.

The major compulsory revisions are presented according to the questions used for the review.

Is the question posed by the author new and well defined?

There is no research questions and the aim of the article is formulated in two different ways “This study aims to explore the operational and academic competencies related to effective teamwork” (p. 4) and “to identify personal teamwork competencies among health services managers” (p. 4). This seems two different angles, the aim should be clarify.

Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?

This part needs important revisions. The weaknesses reside at different levels:
1) There is no indication of how the study framework was developed; it seems to be through literature review but there is no specific indication. Where do the categories of the framework (skills, knowledge, traits, motives) come from? What authors? Has this work been presented somewhere else, if yes the author could refer to it, otherwise she should give more explanations.
2) The instrument for the survey is not described, what type of questionnaire, what is the validity, what choice of responses? Why ask the participant to choose 5 skills? Why 5?
3) There is no description of data analysis, how those data were used? What type of statistical analysis was done and why?
4) The sample should be described more thoroughly.

Are the data sound and well controlled?

Descriptive data are presented as percentage for different skills, knowledge, traits and motives. The data are divided between management teams and clinical teams. What is the rational for this comparison? The 50% benchmark is based on what rational? The comparison analysis is based on Chi Square, what groups are compare, why, what are the hypothesis?

Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

The results are not given in a systematic fashion so that the reader wonders about the different variables being studied. I finally found out that five variables are being studied, gender, age, position, size of the team and type of team (management or clinical). These variables should be
described as well as the analysis based on those variables. There is a need for more information on the Chi Square analysis; considering the size of the sample what is the power of the tests? What is the Beta value?

Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
The discussion and conclusion are well balanced. Taking in account what has been said previously, the discussion is not properly supported by the data. The author based her discussion on the clinical versus management team, it is difficult to understand from the start what is the rational for this distinction, it comes in the discussion but it is too late.
The results are mostly presented as a competency package which is based on the percentage of response over 50%, for which as mentioned before there is no sound rationale.

Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
The title conveys the impression that the author is studying teams members and teamwork rather than teams managers.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**What next?:** Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No
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