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Reviewer's report:

This is a potentially interesting dataset but I had a number of questions/concerns about the modeling approaches. Moreover, there were times when it seemed as if the authors wanted to draw stronger conclusions about prevention/promotion efforts than would be warranted by the design of this study. This is simply a cross-sectional survey study.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The Farmer sample differs from the Community sample on a range of demographic variables that might impact the results. A quick look at Table 1 suggests differences in age, gender, marital status, work status, education, and income. This makes it somewhat challenging to interpret the mean differences in Table 1. It might be worth doing additional analyses to control for all of these factors throughout all analyses.

2. I think the authors need to use multi-group SEM techniques to make formal comparisons between the Farmer sample and Community Sample. The approach used in the paper is to fit separate models for each group and then to make some qualitative comparisons. It is easy enough to test these impressions quantitatively using SEM techniques.

3. In terms of Figure 3, I did not understand why income and the other demographic variables were modeled in what seems to unconventional ways. I also did not understand why there was a directional path from connectedness to efficacy. This approach seems hard to justify theoretically.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. The authors might have made a typo on page 15 when interpreting fit statistics. They mention that adequate fit statistics were obtained for the community sample (CFI = .81) but seem to think the Farmer sample was inadequate (CFI = .90). However, these kinds of differences do not seem to be so clear from the reported statistics. Moreover, many of the models in the paper had CFI values below .95 whereas the authors argue for figures above .95 on page 9.

2. More details about the EFA especially the initial eigenvalues for determining the number of factors to extract. Both of the supra-domains are strongly correlated and this might deserve some comment. This could create concerns
when using both as predictors in models.

Discretionary Revisions
1. Adding a d-metric effect sizes to Table 1 for the t-tests would be helpful.
2. I worried that the language was sometimes too causal given that the data are from a cross-sectional study.
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