Dear XXX:

Please find enclosed a second revision of our manuscript, Predictive Inference Using Latent Variables with Covariates, resubmitted to you for consideration for publication, along with an itemized set of responses to the referees' comments on the previous submission, #PMET-799R1. Our responses refer by page, section or theorem number, to the changes we have made in response to each referee comment.

Concerning your overall instructions regarding the revision:

• We have cited the paper by Meng (1994) on congeniality in multiple imputation and briefly described its relevance to our work, on p. 4 of the revised manuscript.

• The confusion about including X in the expressions in Section 4 was due to poor/unclear writing on our part—we were unclear about whether our results involved a prior distribution (the conditioning model) or a posterior distribution. We have reworded the text in Section 4, specifically surrounding Theorem 4.1 and Corollary 4.3 to clarify that our results involve the prior distribution (conditioning model), and to illustrate the purpose and importance of these results.

• In Section 6, we have now explicitly addressed the concerns about other potential explanations for the apparent bias induced by choice of model in the real data example: we are using only items from a unidimensional subscale of NALS, our IRT model is the same 3-PL unidimensional model that was used in the primary NALS analysis for that subscale, and the NALS conditioning model from which PVs for that subscale were derived is estimated separately in the primary NALS analysis for that subscale. It is not possible to re-implement this version of the MESE model in Mplus or LatentGold, but we would be happy to provide R and WinBUGS code to the referees if they wish to check the correctness of our implementation (and of course the code could be made available in an online supplement to the paper if it is accepted for publication).

We were pleased with the positive responses of referees #2 and #3 on the second round, but my co-authors and I were somewhat concerned about referee #1's critical references to our first- round submission, rather than to the revision we submitted on the second round. We found referee #1's comments helpful in improving the paper on this round, and we hope that the paper is now judged in terms of the content in the present revision, rather than problems in previous versions, which have now been corrected.

We appreciate your continued interest in our work, and we look forward to your further evaluation. Please feel free to contact us if you have any questions or need additional information.

Sincerely,