Supplemental Table	1: Item Factor L	oading and Uniqu	ueness ^a for Visit 1	and Visit 2
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		

Visit 1 (n=182)	Factor 1	Factor 2	Uniqueness
1. This visit was informative/useful to the provider	0.88	-0.00	0.23
2. The provider is willing to implement the key points	0.72	0.36	0.36
3. It is NOT feasible for the provider to implement the key points ^a	0.01	0.97	0.06
4. The key messages were relevant to their practice	0.59	-0.08	0.65
5. The conversation went smoothly	0.67	0.09	0.55
6. The provider is likely to change his/her/their practices as a result of this visit	0.85	-0.03	0.27
Visit 2 (n=158)	Factor 1		Uniqueness
1. This visit was informative/useful to the provider	0.83		0.32
2. The provider is willing to implement the key points	0.79		0.37
3. It is feasible for the provider to implement the key points ^a	0.51		0.74
4. The key messages were relevant to their practice	0.57		0.68
5. The conversation went smoothly	0.66		0.57
6. The provider is likely to change his/her/their practices as a result of this visit	0.83		0.31
^a Polychoric correlation matrix, principal axis factoring, with a varimax rotation ^b The first visit had item 3 written in negative tone which was inverted for analysis; in the second visit the it	tem was rewritten in p	ositive tone	