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Reviewer's report:

The context of care is an important and actual concept. Two instruments are developed to measure this concept based on the PARIHS Framework, of which in this article one is investigated.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The writing style of this article is very complex, due to the fact that the authors want to mention several aspects of this study, which in principal are not necessary for this article. For instances the third paragraph about independent researcher is really redundant.

2. I am still confused what the real aim of this study is. The authors mention three aims. The first aim is to evaluate context assessment tools. One expects an empirical evaluation, but the only thing they do is asking the opinion of 5 experts. This can be put into the method section as "based on the opinion of 5 experts the ACT was used as a tool to measure ....). The second aim was to compare the context between experimental and control wards. However why is this interesting and what do they expect? The third aim is to investigate factors that may have an impact on context. However as I read it well the only factor they investigated was experience, and as context is a ward or institutional characteristic, it seems not logical to investigate this, as they conclude at the end too.

I think that this article has to be rewritten in a more straight way about aspects of the ACT. The authors have nice data about this instrument, and I am sure they can write a nice article about the validity and reliability of this instrument, which would be very helpful for other researchers. For instances they show that it has discriminative power on ward level. Maybe they have more information about the wards which give more information about the validity of the instrument. Another suggestion would be to use also the open-ended questions for measurement of the validity of the instrument.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. The introduction is not really to the point. It is written from the perspective of the TOPIC& project, but I am not convinced that is the main goal of this article.

2. In paragraph 2 of the background the term personalized care is mentioned, but it is not clear what you mean by this.

3. In the data collection part you must describe the instrument and also the other variables you have measured as the experience. You describe it now in the data
analysis paragraph, but it belongs in the data collection part. Furthermore it would be helpful if you give somewhat more information about the ACT. The description is now very short and not really understandable. Maybe you can give some examples.

4. The description of the canonical correlation belongs in the data-analyses paragraph.

5. I don't find a reference to table 5 in the text.
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