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Reviewer’s report:

General
The study is of general interest to researchers in healthcare.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
1) Given the large sample size, the analysis should have been conducted based on type of respondent - perhaps based on supervisory level - so that you can determine whether the results apply similarly to all levels. A measurement equivalence/invariance approach needs to be applied (see Vandenberg & Lance, 2000) to determine the robustness of the findings across these levels.
2) The discussion of poor internal consistency with respect to the scales was a good start but did not note that one reason why internal consistency might have suffered was due to the fact that the items within each subscale were inconsistent with each other from a content perspective. That is, the translation of the items from the original CVF measure resulted in items within each subscale that are likely to receive different ratings from the participants - when that happens, internal consistency will suffer. While there is nothing you can do to fix this issue now (but hopefully will make some adjustments in the future), you should note this so that the readers understand why internal consistency might have suffered.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
1) The CFA results were unclear based on the table presented. What were the chi-square values, degrees of freedom, and chi-square to degrees of freedom ratio? The best model needs to be selected based on parsimony and chi-square, not on the other fit values. The results for the CFA, as presented currently, are confusing to the reader and the rationale for how to select the best model is lacking (and inconsistent with my point in the previous sentence).

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.