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Reviewer’s report:

I appreciate the way the authors have reworked and restructured the paper. The new and full focus on the empirical validation of the ACT remains a somewhat surprising shift. It now presents a much more solid analysis though, that solves with many of my earlier comments.

I need to come back to one my previous comments, however. The methods section on page 6 starts with the statement that: “In our development of the ACT we worked to make it brief enough to be tolerated in busy and resource stretched work settings”. I my previous review, I asked what the authors actually have done to avoid the 20 minutes completion time. Instead, ‘brevity’ is now named as one of the three main principles. This is an appealing term, but how is it actually applied and/or measured? How do we know that the ACT is indeed “brief enough”, “tolerated”? What are specific boundaries or levels that the authors have in mind? Why was the ‘20-minutes’ argument removed from the new version? As 764 nurses have completed the online questionnaire, and 452 persons have pre-tested it, something should be known about completion time and feedback of the respondents about their “tolerance” of the ACT-questionnaire?

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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