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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript that reports on findings from a preliminary investigation of the psychometric properties of the Swedish translation of the Clinical Supervision Evaluation Questionnaire in the context of reflective practice groups in mental health. This is a well-written paper, drawing on a rationalised set of methods, involving metrics of content and construct validity, and internal consistency. The major drawback is the very small sample size (n=20), which warrants caution when interpreting results. My main points for consideration are as follows:

1. Abstract: Please refer to the sample size achieved in this study for transparency. Also, please pay attention to the use of acronyms, e.g. CSEQ appears in the conclusions for the first time; what is the difference between CSEQ-S and CSEQ? (This applies throughout the main text.); the S-CVI acronym is redundant in the abstract; CI has not been defined. The abstract as a whole should be more informative, robust and 'attractive' than it currently is, particularly as the abstract is the first stop for readers (clinicians and researchers). This is a preliminary and underpowered investigation. The reader should be made aware of this upfront. Also, why is there a need for the CSEQ and an investigation on its properties in this context?

2. Introduction (Background): "...and facilitate stress management and team building [7]. While other established evaluation tools..." I feel this is an abrupt transition to the main point of the paper. Why is there a need for evaluation in the mental health RPG context? What sort of evaluation is this? Member evaluation (i.e. self-evaluation) or external? What is the evidence around the benefits of RPG evaluation? How can be self-evaluation achieved? (through valid evaluation tools, one of which is CSEQ...) What other evaluation tools exist? Give references. What are their properties? Surely, being brief is a plus, but how CSEQ compare from a psychometric point of view with other available tools? Currently, all this information is missing. Please revise.

3. Introduction: The very first section needs appropriately referenced.

4. Methods: Did the translation procedure adhere to ISPOR guidelines? Was cognitive interviewing for linguistic validation involved? If not, this must be cited as a limitation.
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