

Response to Reviewer 1 Comments

1. Summary

Thank you very much for taking the time to review this manuscript. Please find the detailed responses below and the corresponding revisions in track changes in the re-submitted files.

2. Questions for General Evaluation

Reviewer's Evaluation

Response and Revisions

Does the introduction provide sufficient background and include all relevant references?

Yes/Can be improved/Must be improved/Not applicable

We have made changes to the introduction based on the reviewers' comments. Please see details of those changes described below.

Are all the cited references relevant to the research?

Yes/Can be improved/Must be improved/Not applicable

We have added additional citations based on the reviewers' recommendations. Please see details of those changes described below.

Is the research design appropriate?

Yes/Can be improved/Must be improved/Not applicable

Are the methods adequately described?

Yes/Can be improved/Must be improved/Not applicable

Are the results clearly presented?

Yes/Can be improved/Must be improved/Not applicable

Are the conclusions supported by the results?

Yes/Can be improved/Must be improved/Not applicable

3. Point-by-point response to Comments and Suggestions for Authors

Comments 1: *The authors of this manuscript researched the relationship between workplace communication and affective outcomes, and in particular the connectedness at work and affective organizational commitment. They consider the frequency of use across five communication modalities in relation to affective outcomes, and their relationships with communication meaningfulness. They completed an online survey to 516 participants, in which the participants self-reported weekly communication tendencies, experienced connectedness, and affective organizational commitment. Their findings include the following ones: generally, participants who reported more frequent communication at work reported higher levels of connectedness and higher affective organizational commitment; employees who found their communication more meaningful (irrespective of frequency) felt the most emotionally connected. They also discuss unique benefits of different communication modalities, as well as implications for hybrid and remote organizations. Globally, the manuscript is very well written and*

organized. There are some minor English issues that should be corrected; please refer to the attached commented PDF document where some of the needed corrections are highlighted.

Response 1: *Thank you for this friendly input. We really appreciate your positive response to the manuscript and appreciate the thoughtful and detailed corrections you provided.*

Comments 2: *Formatting Page 2 lines 85-90.*

Response 2: *Agree, the formatting here was a bit confusing. We have reformatted and made revisions here for clarity. Please see these corrections on page 2 lines 85-91.*

Comments 3: *Paragraph Page 3 line 113.*

Response 3: *We agree that this part of the text really did begin a new idea, so we have made this section a new paragraph. You will see this change on page 3, lines 115-118.*

Comments 4: *Page 4 line 151.*

Response 4: *We have corrected this typo to read “suggested that a minimum”. Please see these changes on page 4, line 152.*

Comments 5: *Page 6 line 219.*

Response 5: *We have corrected this to spell out “Five hundred and twenty-five”. Please see these changes on page 6, line 220.*

Comments 6: *Page 6 line 234.*

Response 6: *We have corrected this typo to read “meaning that sample”. Please see these changes on page 6, lines 235.*

Comments 7: *Page 7 line 257.*

Response 7: *Thank you for this comment. We agree that more information about the participants’ current work is useful. We have added details based on what we know about the sample. We describe participants total working hours, number of hours in work related communication and number of hours in non-work-related communication. Please see page 7, lines 261-265 for these additions.*

Comments 8: *The methodology section lacks information on how the survey was constructed.*

Response 8: *We have corrected this typo to read “by the total number of hours”. Please see these changes on page 4, lines 175-176.*