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**Author’s response to reviews:**

Dear Editor and Reviewers,

We write to thank you for reviewing our revised manuscript, How do professional capital and team heterogeneity affect the demands of team-based service? (MIDM-D-19-00045), for publication in BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making, and appreciate the comments and suggestions for improvement made by all.

We sincerely appreciate the opportunity you have provided to revise and resubmit the manuscript. We have made careful revisions to our manuscript based on your comments, and please see the following point-by-point response letter. In order to show the changes more clearly and make the revised manuscript easier to read, we have colored all changes in red in the new manuscript. Finally, according to Editorial Policies, the data supporting our findings should be provided. However, we are still using these data to write other papers. Thus, for the 'Availability of data and materials' in the Declarations section, we do not wish to share our data. Thank you very much!

Responses to Reviewer 1

Authors did a good job addressing the reviewer's comments. In the revision, a number of pertinent references were added to make the scientific contributions and public health relevance of the work explicit. Major grammatical problems were fixed. Overall, the revised manuscript is in good shape.

Response: We fully appreciate your comments and help with our paper.
Responses to Reviewer 2
It seems that authors have incorporated all suggested corrections of the previous review. However, it would be complete if the level of significant of the acceptance / rejection of the hypotheses is mention in the Table 6.
Response: Thanks for your comments and helpful guidance, and we have added the level of significant of the acceptance / rejection of the hypotheses below the Table 6 in the revised manuscript, “Note: The significant level of accepting/rejecting the hypotheses is at the 0.1 level.”

Responses to Reviewer 3
Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format. Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.
Response: We really appreciate your comments and guidance. We respond to all comments in this box instead of uploading it as an attachment this time. About the Quality of written English and the language corrections, we have worked with a native English-speaking Professor to improve the language and readability of the whole manuscript, and he has extensively and carefully modified our paper to correct use of English language.