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Reviewer’s report:

The additional details help reviewers to understand the strengths and limitations of the current manuscript. In general, I think the authors were fairly response to the previous reviews. I do not necessarily agree with all of the choices but the material in the supplement could be used by others to test alternative models. To that end, I would add means and standard deviations to Table B1 and B2 so others can conduct formal tests of measurement invariance in the SEM-framework for the farmers versus the general community samples.

Discretionary Revisions:

1. Now that reviewers can see the eigenvalues from the EFAs, it is a little hard to understand the justification for a 2-factor solution for farmers. The second eigenvalue had a value of 1.04 for the famers whereas the second eigenvalue in the general community sample had a value of 1.00. The 1.04 is only barely above the K1 rule (or the Kaiser criterion of extracting all eigenvalues-greater-than one). Most methodologists suggest that exclusively using the eigenvalues-greater-than one rule is problematic (see e.g., Fabrigar & Wegener, 2012). Thus, I think the authors need a better justification for the 2-factor model.

2. I also think the differences between the farmer and the general community sample for the EFAs are somewhat hard to explain. Why does health and safety load on Connectedness in one sample but not the other? I think the authors need to say more about this difference at a conceptual level. In general, I think there could be push-back over whether the evidence for a 2-factor versus 1-factor model in each sample is truly compelling.

3. I still think the language is a bit too causal in places but again reasonable people can disagree on this matter.
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