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Dear Professor Dal Poz,

Please find attached our revised submission of manuscript 4821728684140616 - Ten principles of good interdisciplinary team practice. Thank you for the valuable reviewers’ comments. We have addressed all of the comments in the table below, and believe that the manuscript is now much stronger as a result. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you require further information,

Sincerely,

Susan Nancarrow
## Addressing reviewer’s comments 10 principles paper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer 1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major compulsory revisions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This appears to be part of a bigger program of work. At times it is difficult to separate out what has been previously published and what should be included in the manuscript. At times this leads to what appears to be representing previously published data (results of ‘systematic’ review), and at others to references to tools or methods that are published elsewhere but the reader needs to know more about in order to make sense of this study (IMT tool). This somehow needs to be more clearly signposted and enough information included in this report so that it makes sense on its own.</td>
<td>This has been more clearly contextualised in the methods section: This research formed part of a much larger project designed to develop, and implement and evaluate an intervention to enhance interdisciplinary team working with CRAICS [28] was drawn from two data sources through the development of an Interdisciplinary Management Tool [33]. Tool development of the tool involved three systematic reviews, interactions with team members using action research methodology, and capturing extensive, detailed qualitative and quantitative feedback from teams and service users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The methods for the systematic review are underspecified both in the manuscript and in the reference provided. Please describe the search strategy, including search term, inclusion and exclusion criteria etc. Likewise the methods for the qualitative analysis are underspecified and vague.</td>
<td>Because of the requirements for the presentation of the final report, some of the components of the systematic review are presented in the appendices, such as the search strategies (Appendix 10). This is possibly further confused by the fact that we undertook 3 reviews, and some of the methods are presented together (p51, section 3.3 of the report), although those methods that are combined are clearly labelled as such. Inclusion criteria for the review referred to in this document are provided on p54 (unfortunately the heading for this section is incorrect and refers to a separate literature review, which may have further confused this issue). The literature review is part of a peer-reviewed, published, stand-alone report, and we hope we have now made it clear that we refer to this as a secondary source of data for the purpose of this paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minor essential revisions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is some inconsistent use of terms – interdisciplinary team practice in the title,</td>
<td>We have now consistently used the term “team work” in the title and throughout the text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
interdisciplinary team working or interdisciplinary working in the text.

The abstract implies a systematic review of the literature is to be undertaken. However further on (page 9) it transpires that this review has been previously reported and will not be reported in detail. The published report referred to does not contain a search strategy that justifies the term “systematic review”. Please provide the search terms and results. In the first paragraph of the discussion, page 14, reference is made to the systematic review, “which did not require significant amendment from its original protocol. What is team working as opposed to teamwork?

Page 3 paragraph 1
First sentence -unclear meaning – in what way is interdisciplinary team working a “complex intervention”? What is the intervention?

Paragraph 2 second sentence interventions designed to improve the frequency of what? Please specify.

Page 8 – it is only at this point that the focus of community rehabilitation and intermediate care services becomes apparent. Perhaps this could be stated earlier.

Methods
Page 9 See above comments. For the methods of the systematic review we are referred to ref 31 but this doesn’t clearly specify the methods as expected in reporting a systematic review.

Page 10. The Interdisciplinary Management Tool requires explanation.

Page 11 Results of the thematic synthesis.

It is unclear what the substrate is for this thematic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Revised Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>interdisciplinary team working or interdisciplinary working in the text.</td>
<td>The abstract implies a systematic review of the literature is to be undertaken. However further on (page 9) it transpires that this review has been previously reported and will not be reported in detail. The published report referred to does not contain a search strategy that justifies the term “systematic review”. Please provide the search terms and results. In the first paragraph of the discussion, page 14, reference is made to the systematic review, “which did not require significant amendment from its original protocol. What is team working as opposed to teamwork?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 3 paragraph 1</td>
<td>This has been changed to read “a complex process”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First sentence -unclear meaning – in what way is interdisciplinary team working a “complex intervention”? What is the intervention?</td>
<td>To improve interdisciplinary team working – corrected in text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 2 second sentence interventions designed to improve the frequency of what? Please specify.</td>
<td>This is now made clearer in the abstract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 8 – it is only at this point that the focus of community rehabilitation and intermediate care services becomes apparent. Perhaps this could be stated earlier.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>See comment above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 9 See above comments. For the methods of the systematic review we are referred to ref 31 but this doesn’t clearly specify the methods as expected in reporting a systematic review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 10. The Interdisciplinary Management Tool requires explanation.</td>
<td>This is explained in more detail within the methods section of the paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 11 Results of the thematic synthesis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is unclear what the substrate is for this thematic</td>
<td>This has been addressed as per the previous comments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Is it titles of selected articles, key findings of individual articles, previous summaries from meta-analyses or reviews? Without clarification it could also include the transcripts of the IMT training sessions. Please clarify.

Page 12 Please report the results of the thematic analysis of the characteristics of good teams, and the challenges from the IMT intervention. Please clarify in the methods section how the different thematic analyses were combined to form Table 3.

These have now been added as tables 2 and 3.

Page 14

Discussion – it’s unclear what the statement ’and did not require significant amendment from it’s original protocol” applies to. Please clarify Page 15. Please present the results, which support the statement re “the possible existence of a hierarchical component to the ten characteristics of good ...”.

Often systematic reviewing protocols require amendment when the nature of the included literature becomes clear [1]. In this case, no amendment was required.

The reference to our own findings has been removed and a published reference inserted instead to support this point.

Reviewer 2

Major compulsory revision

1. Details about participant consent and ethics committee approval must be included in the methods section

This has been added to the methods section.

Discretionary revisions

1. I know this literature well and there is much that is left out. This is a surprise as it is claimed to be a systematic review. A look at the CAIPE journal could be beneficial.

We believe that this is a systematic inclusion of the literature as stated.

2. There is nothing new in this work and this could be recognised by the authors. There are many versions of similar competency statements published especially in Canada so mostly of interest as confirmatory work. This is a good paper but not new information for those in the field.

We dispute this claim. There are some unpublished, context specific examples of interdisciplinary team competencies, and there are several published examples of interdisciplinary team competencies for use in interdisciplinary education. These have been established with a different purpose and context and have quite a different emphasis to those presented in this paper. We are not aware of any published examples of interdisciplinary team competencies, and in particular, none that are supported by empirical data. This argument is further supported by reviewer 3 who published the
seminal work on team competencies, and accepted this paper without modification. We have undertaken a thorough search to explore this issue, and followed the references to the Leggat paper.