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Re-review

The authors have attempted to address all of the recommendations of the reviewers, which is appropriate. However, in some cases this has made the manuscript unwieldy and actually more confusing. For example, now the authors report a large number of fit indices for their analyses, yet do so uncritically. I suggest that the authors be clear on the indices that they use to assess the SEM models particularly. See Hayduk et al (2007) in Personality and Individual Differences. I also suggest that the authors work through the manuscript to shorten and tighten each section.

The authors have responded to my query about the unit of analysis and indicated that ICCs were completed and provided. The authors decided to continue to analyze at the individual level. I was unable to find the ICCs in the tables and additional files provided. Without this, I am still suspicious that the data may be more highly correlated within teams than unadjusted between individuals from multiple disciplines across the organization.

Results and Table 3: The results do not contain testing information for model 3 (short version). It's not clear why this was not added since it is offered as an option. Providing shorter versions that are psychometrically sound for use in busy healthcare work places is important to reduce respondent burden.

Discussion: It is not clear what the authors mean by the results being "productive". Nor how the authors distinguish the optimal version from the short version. Which is preferred and in what setting?

Some of the discussion points actually speak against the validity and reliability of the tool and would be better in the limitations. For example, the first paragraph on page 25 speaks to issues with reliability.

English - sample size is "small", not low.

Table 1: The subtitles for average work week, number of years in the organization, and position should reflect frequency and %, rather than mean and SD.

Also the % for Gender does not add up to 100%.
Additional file 1 - also not clear why short version is not shown.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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