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Reviewer's report:

The authors have considered my comments thoughtfully and completely, and have addressed them to my satisfaction. I think the representation of the factor analysis as a CFA strengthens the conceptual rigor and appreciate the statement of intent to research poorly functioning items in the future when more data is available.

I have only one major question related to the ROC. The authors state that 7 out of the 20 practices had OR4KT scores set at 0, yet Table 5 has 14 values, so I am not sure if there is an error there.

I am also unsure about the authors' decision to select 50% as the cutoff for the known groups validity analysis. Known groups validity is intended to determine whether two groups that should have logically different levels of a construct reflect this difference in the measured scores, but I am having a hard time understanding why there should be a hypothesized difference between practices where 50% of the physicians agree to participate in PVS III and those that do not. That seems arbitrary to me and a low bar. Despite the note of caution in the discussion section, I remain skeptical about the utility of the ROC analysis and about the proposition that a score of 64.48 means anything meaningful in practice. There are two practices (Bolueta and Ellorio) that have engagement higher than 60%. Conceptually, it seems more conceptually justifiable to propose the score of a practice that has engagement of 60% or more as the cut off and presenting the ROC curve. If the cutoff score results in a number of practices with a lower engagement % but a higher OR4KT score, this would be an important area to point our for future research. But without justification for why 50% was selected, this analysis seems more like an exercise to propose a cutoff score than having any bearing on what it means in practice. I would encourage the authors to consider this further.
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