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Reviewer's report:

I thank for the opportunity to review the revised manuscript, which I have read with great interest. The revised version of the manuscript provides a definition of group trust, explores factors influencing group trust and proposes a model linking the factors together.

In my eyes, the manuscript still needs a better structure and argumentation line, especially in the result section. This aligns with the suggestion by Reviewer 3 of the previous review round, to better structure the article around it aims.

Please see further comments below:

Background

* I would suggest deleting the sentence in line 48-50, page 4. It provides extra information that is not necessary for the rest of the article.

* I would suggest to move the sentence "Additionally, although some recent studies describe data sources that competency committees use and how they weigh this information in their collective decisions, health professions education research has not studied trust within these committees and trust in committee decisions from individuals either within or outside the group." (p 5, line 27-34) to line 10 on the same page.

Thus right before the sentence "Scholars outside…".

* The section about theoretical frameworks needs a better introduction. Why do you need a framework? What will it add?

* I would also suggest to delete the paragraph about social exchange theory and social information theory (p 6, Line 52 & p 7, line 11-16). It provides extra information that is not necessary for the rest of the article.
Results

* You provide in the abstract and the discussion section your definition of trust, but not in the result section. I would exclude the definition of trust on the individual level (p.10, line 44-50) from the text, as it is already provided in table 2. Instead, I would provide here your definition of group trust.

* The title of Figure 2 is confusing. You provide a definition of group trust in the abstract and discussion. In my eyes, the figure itself does not represent a definition.

Also, the introduction to Figure 2 (p.11, line 40-45) does not state that this is a definition of group trust.

* I would exclude the paragraph about cognitive and affective foundations (p. 11, line 22-31). It provides extra information that is not necessary for the rest of the article.

* I miss a headline in the result section for the second aim of the article: examining factors influencing group trust. I understand that this aim is closely connected to the proposition of the model of group trust. However, I had difficulty to relocate the aims of the article in the result section.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal