Reviewer’s report

Title: Trust and Respect in the Patient-Clinician Relationship Preliminary Development of a New Scale

Version: 0 Date: 16 Sep 2019

Reviewer: Fredrik Falkenstrom

Reviewer's report:

Review of PSYO-D-19-00184 "Trust and Respect in the Patient-Clinician Relationship: Preliminary Development of a New Scale"

This manuscript describes the development and initial testing of a new self-report measure of patient trust in their therapist. The authors delineate the importance of trust in the therapy relationship mostly from an attachment theory standpoint, and the overlap as well as difference between trust and working alliance. They describe the development of the new scale for measuring trust, and the psychometric evaluation of this scale on a sample of 218 outpatients. Using Item Response Theory, the authors show that the items of the scale contain proper information on the latent trait. Moreover, the scale did not seem to overlap too much with the WAI-SR, and could predict a more behavioral measure of trust in the form of willingness to share social media posts with their therapist.

I found this manuscript well-written, the conclusions balanced, and the study methodologically well conducted. I do not have any major objections. One thing though, if the mean of the item is represented as zero on the latent trait scale (the X-axis of Figure 1), then the measure seems to mostly be able to differentiate among low levels of trust since the information curve slope goes steeply down at around zero? So at levels above the mean/zero of the latent trait, there is basically no information at all. Not sure if this is a major problem with the scale, perhaps low levels of trust are more important to discriminate than high levels, but if this is so it should probably be stated.

(Very minor) On p. "One study of 17 clinicians and 48 clinicians …" I assume it should have been 48 patients?
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?
If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal