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Comments and Suggestions for Authors

I appreciate your detailed responses to my comments and efforts to improve your manuscript. Now, I better understand your intentions and believe that the manuscript is much better.

Our response:

Thank you for taking the time to review the revised version of our manuscript almost instantly after being invited to do so. We are happy that we were able to convey the rationale of our manuscript in a more explicit, reader-friendly, and appealing way.

Regarding the selection of the five concepts, you explained how you found them in your response but it is necessary to applied to the introduction of your paper as well. Since those five consist of the based framework, more information about them may be needed.

Our response:

Thank you for making us aware that we need to explain and justify the focus on the five facets of work-related rumination to the readers – less familiar with the work-related rumination literature – as well. Thank you for suggesting a concrete quick fix to this issue. In the re-revised version of the manuscript we have added elements from our response to your last comment. We have integrated these arguments on page 2. Changes are highlighted in red font. We are optimistic that we succeed in conveying much better a decision that appeared straightforward to us, but which may not have been as clear to see to the readers in the earlier versions of the paper.
You can add your points on validity tests in your response (the last paragraph of page 2) as another problem of why your study is necessary.

Our response:

Thank you for this suggestion to further improve the rationale of the study. We followed your suggestion and have included elements from our last response to you. Changes are highlighted in red font.

In the strengths and limitations section, authors stated the limitation of self-reported data from a single source. Authors may run a common method variance test (Harman's is not recommended) to check the common method bias and can provide an appropriate remedy if much bias is found.

Our response:

Thank you for suggesting being less defensive with regard to single-source bias or common method bias. We would prefer keeping the discussion on potential method bias short for two reasons:

1. Relevance of method bias to the main conclusions: Method bias is unlikely to threaten the validity of our focal results regarding the structure of work-related rumination and the convergent/discriminant validity of the five facets. The contribution of our study is providing a rich picture of nomological network rather than establishing one specific bivariate link. Moreover, for instance, Spector (2006) makes a case that method bias may not affect correlations among a set of focal variables universally and strongly as one might think. Spector even cautions against controlling for something, which may not be present. In the discussion we already explain that it is hard to explain the nuanced patterns of results (including many non-significant links between work-related rumination and well-being) found in our study alternatively purely be method artifacts.

2. Problems of statistical remedies: As suggested by Podsakoff and colleagues (2012), all (post-hoc) statistical remedies against common method bias have been criticized or may suffer from considerable limitations. Following recommendation by Podsakoff and colleagues (2003), we have examined the role of common method bias in changing the patterns of association between the five facets of work-related rumination and the well-being variables. We have run additional analyses. More specifically, we have specified a model similar to our focal structural equation model as depicted in Figure 2 controlling for the effects of an unmeasured latent methods factor. In line with cautionary notes from the methods literature, we faced identification problems with this model and received numerous warnings upon examining the common method variance model. There might be alternative avenues like marker variables to consider common method bias. However, we believe that we would have to put in considerable effort to finally arrive at a still rather imperfect solution to a minor point.

Given that method bias seems to be a minor threat to the validity of our results, we suggest that we do not add further details to the discussion of method bias in the manuscript beyond the issues we have added in the last revision. In our view, statistical remedies would require additional space and still provide only a limited account of a potential problem, which is unlikely to alter the conclusions of our study. However, in the discussion section, we have added a short note explaining that we have followed recommendations from the literature to reduce method bias, by designing the survey in a way that makes systematic bias less likely. We hope that our suggestion of not adding extensive discussion to an already quite long manuscript appears reasonable to the editorial team.
