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Reviewer's report:

The adaptations the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments resulted in an improved manuscript. In my opinion, including the operational definitions of all concepts is the most important adaptation adding to improved quality. However, having read the revised manuscript, and the rebuttals the authors made in response to my comments, I am afraid I cannot fully accept this version of the paper for publication. In sum, I have three remarks that need additional attention - some easier to solve than others:

1. The authors' rebuttals to the comments I raised really clarified my understanding of the way mental health care is organised in Canada and why they conducted their analyses the way they did. However, as I am probably not the only reader of the manuscript, and what is indistinct for me, might be hazy for others as well. Therefore, I recommend the authors to integrate their responses to my comments (more) in the paper. In my opinion, the justification for using the Bronstein model (comment / rebuttal 3) and for applying different alpha-levels for the bivariate and multivariate analyses (comment / rebuttal 14; in a footnote?) are especially worth mentioning.

2. According to the abovementioned comment, I would recommend the authors to rephrase the Analyses section where they mention the bivariate analyses, and perhaps also the presentation of the bivariate regression analyses in Table 2. After reading the authors' answer to my previous comments, I now understand that the authors conducted bivariate regression analyses (as a first step), but the way they describe it in the Analyses section is confusing, since they only mention t-test / ANOVA (which is a more common way to report on the comparison of means of n different (discrete) groups). Likewise, the heading 'bivariate' in Table 2, above 'bèta-coefficient', is confusing as well. (A correlation matrix could have been another (easier?) first step, helping out to sort the IVs relevant for the multiple regression analyses?)

3. And last but not least: I am worried about the way the authors report on the instruments and scales they have used. I am not familiar with most of these scales, but I was interested in how the authors had inventoried knowledge sharing. I consulted the reference the authors provided (Bock et al., 2005). Bock et al. (2005) mention two scales referring to knowledge sharing (i.e. 'attitude toward knowledge sharing', and 'intention to share knowledge'). Unfortunately, at this point, it is not clear to me which items / scale the authors used to operationalize knowledge sharing in the paper under review. In addition, the authors state they used a 5 item scale with a 7-point Likert scale for answers. However, Bock et al. (2005) state their measures employ 5-point Likert scales... Changing answer categories, and even using a selected set of items of a full questionnaire (and thus in fact changing the order of item administration) may influence the validity of the scale. In the light of replication, I expect the authors to make it very clear which scales / items they used (perhaps add them in appendix?) Furthermore, I think it is important to at least mention the risks that might follow from the methods used. (Perhaps the authors could provide the alpha interal consistency they found in their sample for each of the scales?)
I am sorry to be so critical and to insist on some of the points made earlier. Yet, I strongly believe that scientific scrutiny and transparency distinguish excellent researchers from regular ones, and I think this work has the potential in it to become excellent...
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