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Reviewer's report:

This valuable study addresses two important variables in the patient-clinician relationship, patient trust and respect for the clinician. The literature review is well developed for the trust variable, but not so much for the respect variable, so it seems unbalanced and less convincing for the latter. I would recommend a better review and argument for including respect in the questionnaire. A minor point, I would suggest using the term "negatively worded" for "reversed scored" on p. 9, line 179. Did the researchers ask respondents whether they posted to social media? I would think this would be important in conjunction with their answer to the question of whether they would share their posts? I was puzzled by the description of the test information curve given lines 259-260 on p. 13 ("The curve peaks slightly below the mean with another peak at the mean") -- it looks to me that there is one peak slightly below the mean (theta = 0) and another, somewhat larger peak 2SD below the mean, and that the information curve drops quite precipitously between the mean and about +.5 SD above the mean. This is pretty typical for scales with generally high means, like this scale, with item means uniformly above 6 on a 7 point scale. This means that more reliable information is obtained from clients rating their trust & respect relatively lower than the average patient -- probably the range that would be of more interest to clinicians at least. I would recommend revisiting this part of the results/discussion section with a bit more elaboration in each. Overall I think this scale is a valuable contribution.
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