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Author’s response to reviews:

AUTHOR’S RESPONSE

TITLE: Validity and Reliability of the Greek Version of Implementation Leadership Scale (ILS) PSYO-D-19-00259.

First of all we would like to thank you for reviewing and potentially accepting our manuscript.

All the corrections are marked with yellow color in the revised manuscript and in the tables.

In the following, there are the comments of the editor and the reviewers and our responses which are marked with "RE".

RESPONSE TO THE EDITOR

Editor Comment: "Please confirm whether your study was submitted to and approved by your institutional ethics committee and include a statement to this effect in your Methods and Ethics approval and consent to participate sections. Please also ensure that the full name of your ethics committee is included in this statement. If the need for ethics approval was waived by an IRB or is deemed unnecessary according to national regulations, please clearly state this, including the name of the IRB or a reference to the relevant legislation"

RE: In the "ethics approval" sub-section we made a clear statement regarding the submission and approval of our study both from the Ethics Committee of the School of Social Sciences of the Hellenic Open University and from the Scientific Council of the Private Hospital "Hygeia A.E" in Athens, were the research was conducted. We also added registration numbers for both approvals. Consent for participation is described in the participants and procedure sub-section. (Page 5).
RESPONSE TO THE FIRST REVIEWER

All the corrections are marked with yellow color in the revised manuscript and in the tables.

In the following, there are the comments of the editor and the reviewers and our responses which are marked with "RE".

Reviewer Comment: "In the abstract, translation method, content validity and face validity were missed"

RE: We added in the abstract information concerning translation method, content validity and face validity (both in methods and results).

Reviewer Comment: "The method section was well developed, too. However, in my opinion reporting the instruments' total scoring and their cut of point is needed"

RE: We added total and sub-scales scoring for all instruments. We also added the number of items for each Organizational Climate Measure subscale. All scales do not have specific cut of point, which was also added in all three cases. (Page 5 and Page 6 – at the end of the paragraphs where each scale is presented).

Reviewer Comment: "You chose participants from a private general Obstetrics and Gynecology hospital in Greece. In this approach, variation of participants did not observed. Besides, the sample size is very small"

RE: We added in the limitations section that all the participants came from one hospital and that the variation of participants did not observed. Regarding the sample size, we had already mentioned it as the first limitation. (Page 12-13. Limitations sub-section).

Reviewer Comment: "Translation method, face validity and content validity must be written in this section"

RE: Translation method sectioned was re-written. We provided details of the steps followed and a flow diagram (see Figure 1) presenting the steps that were followed for the translation, adaptation and psychometric validation. Face validity and content validity procedures were also added. (Page 7-8. Translation sub-section and Figure 1).

Reviewer Comment: "Is the Quality of leadership dimension of the Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire Version II (COPSOQ II) which was used for the convergent validity assessment, translated and validated in Greece? Is the Organizational Climate Measure translated and validated in Greece?"
RE: Both Quality of leadership dimension of the Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire Version II (COPSOQ II) and Organizational Climate Measure are not translated and validated in Greece. We mentioned it in the manuscript and we wrote about the procedure of their translation that were similar, but not the same with ILS. (Page 8 at the end). Additionally, we added the information about their internal consistency in the method sub-section that they were described. (Page 6 and 7 respectively).

Reviewer Comment: "Which method has been used for translation of Implementation Leadership Scale (ILS)?"

RE: Our approach was based on the systematic approach of World Health Organization regarding translation and adaptation of research instruments. In the Translation sub-section we provided details for the steps of the procedure. (Page 7-8. Translation sub-section).

Reviewer Comment: "In findings section, you did not report face and content validity"

RE: We add a sub-section in the results section, presenting findings regarding face and content validity (Page 9. Face and Content validity sub-section of Results).

Reviewer Comment: "Cronbach alpha coefficient before CFI did not report!"

RE: We made the change you proposed and we put the reliability results before the validity results. (Page 10).

Reviewer Comment: "In discussion section, it is recommended the authors compare these findings with the results of translation and validation of this instrument in other languages"

RE: We found results for validation of the instrument only in Chinese language. We add and compared the findings of the Chinese and our study in the discussion section (Page 11-12. At the end of the first paragraph of the discussion section).

Reviewer Comment: "Implications of this study must be written"

RE: We added a "study implications" sub-section after limitations. (Page 13).

Reviewer Comment: "It is not clear what the results of the research added to the existing knowledge"

RE: In the "study implications" sub-section" we tried to make clear the contribution of our study in the existing knowledge. (Page 13).
RESPONSE TO THE SECOND REVIEWER

All the corrections are marked with yellow color in the revised manuscript and in the tables.

In the following, there are the comments of the editor and the reviewers and our responses which are marked with "RE".

Reviewer Comment: "The Abstract should be revised so as to accurately and concisely summarise the results of the Confirmatory Factor Analyses that is the goodness-of-fit indices"

RE: Results of main CFA indices were added in a parenthesis in the abstract.

Reviewer Comment: "Provide a figure of flow diagram presenting the steps that were followed for the translation, adaptation and psychometric validation"

RE: We added figure 1 where we provide the information that you mentioned. In text also we added some additional information to make clear the translation procedure. (Figure 1. and Page 7-8. Translation sub-section).

Reviewer Comment: "The authors should consider provide details of Face and Content Validity from the results of the pilot testing that was conducted by 9 volunteer participants"

RE: We add some details concerning face and content validity and the procedure that was followed in the pilot study. (Page 7-8. Translation sub-section). Moreover, in the results we add a sub-section about the findings regarding face and content validity. (Page 9. Face and Content validity sub-section of Results).

Reviewer Comment: "In Table 2 please provide values of Communality and Cronbach's alpha if item deleted- for each of the items"

RE: Cronbach's alpha’s if item deleted- for each item were added in the table 2. However, we did not add communalities since we did not run Exploratory Analysis. Our purpose was to test the proposed model of the authors of the scale using CFA.

Reviewer Comment: "Acceptable internal consistency is indicated by a Cronbach's alpha of around 0.70 (DeVellis, 2011), the reported results range from 0.85 to 0.94 for the subscales while for the total scale. These high values can be indicative of may suggest redundancies and unidimensionality. This should be noted in the paper and acknowledged as a limitation or area of future research"
RE: We added your mention at the discussion section (Page 12. Last line of the discussion section). Additionally, as you recommended, we mentioned it at the conclusions section where we discuss issues regarding future research. (Page 13. Last line of the conclusions section).

Reviewer Comment: "Path diagram with standardised factor loading of the 12 item four-factor structure of the Greek Version of Implementation Leadership Scale (ILS)"

RE: The path diagram with the standardized factor loadings was added (see Figure 2).