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Reviewer's report:

General

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

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

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

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

This is the second revision of this article. The subject of the article is interesting and relevant; there is little research on the management of teams and of collaboration. The author has responded to most of the major comments in a satisfactory fashion.

Is the question posed by the author new and well defined? Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work? Are the data sound and well controlled?

The aim of the study is clear and relevant to the field of collaboration. The article aims at describing the answers given by respondents that were asked to identify the most important competencies that make a person contribute to the performance of a team. This part is quite informative. A second aspect of the description is done through the comparison of the answers of respondents that answered considering either a management team or a clinical team. The author underlines the limit of this comparison since the sample is unbalanced, 196 for the management teams and 26 for the clinical teams. The entire article is still based on this comparison.

There is a third aspect of the article, the data are analysed comparing the answers of the respondents (only for the managers teams) in relation to three variables: sex, position and size of team of the respondents. The author is relating to these analyses as post hoc analysis. It seems that this type of analysis needs to be based on a rational taken from the literature. There is some succinct description of the literature that is presented too late in the article. These analyses take an important place in the results section but they are almost completely evacuated in the discussion. If the author wants to maintain these analyses, there should be a more systematic approach.

The authors have clarified the development of the framework. The author is mentioning that a pre-test has been done without indication of the nature of the pre-test (p.6).

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

Ok. The references are given without any order either order of presentation in the text or alphabetical order?

Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

See above

Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?

OK

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)


What next?: Accept after minor essential 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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