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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for allowing me to review this work. The authors do a very nice job at describing their multi-modal methods used during alpha testing of an eLearning module. Readers not savvy in these methods would appreciate the level of detail offered in the manuscript.

I do, however, have a few minor suggestions regarding the manuscript:

1) Line 84 "real world" --> "practical application"

2) Lines 96-101: Would like to have seen more details regarding participating providers beyond education and experience..eg. role in practice, type of community served, attitude toward computer-based learning...

3) continuing same point...reviewing rating or thematic differences amongst participating groups could help with generalizability, or at a minimum, help ID specific differences for specific targeted communities.

4) LINE 122: You tell the reader the Training Satisfaction Rating Scale has demonstrated validity and reliability but fail to add context. Please add the setting/context/application in which validity evidence was supported.

5) LINE 138: Did you check for normal distribution to justify use of Mean? If so, state that. If distribution was nonparametric, would consider reporting median and not mean.

6) LINE 182: "lukewarm" perhaps "ambivalent"

7) LINE 281- "attenuated" Not sure this is the correct word you're looking for. Please review.
8) LINE 362: "enhance validity of the data": Archaic language. New Standards (AERA, NCME, APA, 2014) would suggest you use the language "better support validity evidence" or some sort. Semantics, but not trivial to validity researchers.
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