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Reviewer's report:

General

This paper is very much improved from the previous version and I think most of my original comments have been addressed satisfactorily. However, there are some outstanding issues, which I have outlined below.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

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

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.

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.

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.

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?

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

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.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.