Dear Dr. Mittman,

Thank you for provisionally accepting our manuscript, *Assessing an organizational culture instrument based on the Competing Values Framework* (#3697413001077852).

We agreed with all of the reviewers' additional revisions. Attached on separate pages we briefly describe how we addressed each revision.

We have also resolved the formatting issues that Ms. Girard alerted us to.

In addition, I made one unsolicited change on page 7, which I wanted to alert you to. I added a footnote to explain that the origins of the CVF instrument are unclear, being attributed to two apparently different sources by two sets of researchers who worked closely on some of the early research conducted with the instrument. I think this will be of interest to the reader, however, it is non-essential and can be removed if necessary.

We are very happy to have our paper published in Implementation Science, and will be happy to address any final issues that may arise.

Sincerely,

Christian D. Helfrich, MPH, PhD

Attachments
Response to Reviewer A
Manuscript 3697413001077852

Dr. Whalley raised five minor, essential revisions and one discretionary one.

Our responses are below, preceded by the text of the reviewers’ comments.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. The methods section mentioned the assessment of inter-item correlations but these are not reported in the results.

Thank you for catching this oversight. For brevity sake, we elected to remove the description of the inter-item correlations, and have corrected the Methods section. The inter-item correlations were just a first step to the comparison of the item-rest correlation and the correlations of the item to the other subscales. Since it is these latter comparisons that were essential for establishing that the divergent properties of subscales were poor, we simply dropped all mention of the individual inter-item correlations.

2. I would suggest omitting the sentence “We also tested alternative models of the two-factor solution …… which had a low reliability.” (bottom of page 17). The modifications made are not very well justified at this point (e.g. item 10 has a loading of >0.40 on one factor and <0.40 on the other, thereby adhering to the 0.40 cutpoint imposed by the authors), but do become clearer later on.

A good suggestion, and we have done so.

3. The discussion of the characteristics of the ‘simplified 12-item, two-factor model’ in the discussion (page 25) describes the prescriptive culture subscale as having 3 items and differing from the hierarchical subscale only in the absence of item 13. However, item 2 was also omitted from the 12-item version and was also from the hierarchical/prescriptive scale, leaving only 2 items. The discussion needs to be amended accordingly and some comment as to the likely value of a two-item scale would seem appropriate.

Thank you for catching this. That is correct that item 2 was also omitted. However, as noted below, item 10 cross-loaded on both factors, so the prescriptive culture subscale does have three items. However, Dr. Whalley was correct that our description of the prescriptive culture needed updating. We have rewritten the paragraph on prescriptive culture to correct this. We also still agreed with Dr. Whalley's point about the likely value of a scale comprising few items and took the step of commenting on it (page 26).

4. The discussion of the cross-loading of item 10 in the discussion (page 26) states, “One item, Item 10 from the rational subscale loaded almost equally onto humanistic...
and prescriptive cultures, but neither at significant levels”. This statement, carried
over from the previous version of the paper, is no longer correct.

Thank you for catching this, it has been corrected to note that the loadings were
significant for the humanistic subscale and nearly significant for the prescriptive
subscale.

5. Should the sentence “Our study raises questions about the validity of ... when applied
to a sample of managers” (top of page 28) refer to non-managers rather than
managers?

You are correct, thank you for catching this.

Discretionary Revisions

1. The authors define item-to-scale correlations as the correlation between an item and
the aggregate of all other items in the measure. This is difficult to justify without first
showing that the overall scale is valid. It would be more appropriate to use the
correlation between an item and each of the other three scales; this would also make
a more meaningful exploration of the item convergent and divergent properties in the
context of the original CVF.

This is an excellent idea, and we agreed. Table 1 has been modified with four columns (1
each for the four CVF subscales) replacing the two columns previously housing item-rest
and item-scale correlations. The correlations for an item to its own subscale are in fact the
item-rest correlations, but they are now spread across the four columns. We provide
footnotes to the table explaining this, and identify the item-rest correlations using italics.
The manuscript has been modified (pages 11, 14) to reflect the information in the updated
table.
Dr. Etchegaray proposed one discretionary revision.

1. My only comment concerns the ME/I test that you conducted. While I understand why you chose to not report the results, the section on external validity seems to indicate that ME/I should be examined, as opposed to actually being examined as indicated in your response letter. Given that you have findings that speak to a test of ME/I for your study, I think you should mention that you tested for this and based on the results (which you will not include, but are available upon request), you decided to focus only on the employees.

This is an excellent suggestion, and we have accordingly revised this portion of the Discussion (pages 20-21).