The Editor,Thank you for the opportunity to revise and resubmit our manuscript. We thank the anonymous reviewers for their detailed and helpful suggestions which have helped us in improving this paper. All the changes in the paper have been highlighted in yellow.

In the document below, we respond to each point of reviewer feedback in italics.

The authors.

**DETAILS ON CHANGES MADE TO MANUSCRIPT IN RESPONSE TO FEEDBACK RECEIVED**

1. The literature review needs to be expanded substantially to include
review of previous literature on what drives corporate reputation and major
consequences or outcomes of corporate reputation. For instance, strategic
communication has been studied as a key driver of corporate reputation, but
this body of literature was not mentioned in the authors’ literature review.

*Thanks. On page 2 and 3 we have added to the literature review and deliberated upon key research findings on what drives corporate reputation and major
consequences or outcomes of corporate reputation. Additionally, strategic communication as a driver of corporate reputation has also been discussed.*

1. The RepTrak TM model needs to be more specifically elaborated in the
literature review before proposing the research questions.

*On pages 5 and 6, the formation of the Reputation Quotient and RepTrak TM model have been presented together with the drivers. The scale validity has also been discussed.*

1. In the method section, some information was a bit ambiguous and needs
clarification. 1) were the two mid-level employee who distributed the
questionnaire in their respective organizations from the authors’ personal
networks? Was the sampling process convenience sampling? Did the authors
obtain consent from both organizations for their employees to participate?
How many employees from each organization participated in the study?

*Thanks. This information has been provided in the Research Methodology section.*

1. Please provide details of respondents’ demographics

*Thanks. The same has been provided on pages 12-13 in Table 2*

1. In Table 1, the same item “builds emotional connect with customers”
appeared under both the factor of “stakeholder relationships” and
“customer centricity”.

*Thanks. This was an error and has been corrected in Table 1*

1. I suggest the authors reconsider the use of the label “stakeholder
relationships.” There’s a whole body of literature out there about
stakeholder relationships. This is a stand-alone concept that can be
distinguished from reputation. In fact, previous studies have demonstrated
reciprocal relationships between organizational reputation and
organization-stakeholder relationships. It’s confusing to propose it as a
defining dimension of corporate reputation. In addition, the items under
“stakeholder relationships” also covers fairness and social and moral
codes, which do not directly reflect the concept of “stakeholder
relationships.”

*Thanks. The label of stakeholder relationships has been changed to stakeholder connect and highlighted throughout the text.*

1. The second part of the study examined the impact of the eight dimensions
of corporate reputation as defined by Indian employees on four outcomes of
loyalty, engagement, emotional connect and commitment. There’re a few
issues here: 1) Why were these four outcomes examined in this study? How was
each defined? 2) What statistical analysis was used to examine the effects?
Statistical/numerical results were missing in the results section regarding the effects of the attributes on the four outcomes. 3) Why did the authors
choose to examine the effect of each attribute on the outcomes instead of
the eight factors of corporate reputation on these four outcomes? There’s no point of looking at individual attributes at this point given that the
eight factors were already derived from the EFA analysis.

*The four outcomes were based on existing literature. The definitions for each of these outcomes are provided on pages 25, 26 and 27.*

*There are no statistical/numerical results concerning the effects of the attributes on the four outcomes. This is a limitation of the study and has been included in the section on limitations.*

*As the current study is exploratory in nature with no existing research in the Indian context which would have provided us with a base to attribute definition, we studied each attribute and its impact on the outcome.*

1. The authors referred to the four outcomes (LEEC) as supportive employee
behaviors; however, these are mostly attitudinal outcomes instead of actual
behaviors

*Thank you. Literature also cites the four outcomes as behaviors/behavioral disposition. We have referred to the existing literature on page 22.*

1. In the discussion section, the theoretical contributions of this study
need to be more thoroughly discussed.

*Thanks. Changes have been incorporated and additions made to the discussion section enumerating the contribution of the paper to existing research.*

1. The author(s) state that “scholarly attention to reputation perceptions
 in emerging markets has been on the rise” and I believe this is the
 premise of this manuscript and makes it significant for the literature.
 The paper could also cite other international studies from different
 markets, including the following studies focusing on organizational
 reputation from the Turkish context: Ozdora-Aksak, E. and Atakan-Duman,
 S. 2016; Ozdora-Aksak, E. 2015.

*Thank you for the recommendation and the valuable observation. We have incorporated the suggested source along with other relevant citations on this topic.*

1. I think adapting an existing scale - standardized measurement is
 RepTrakTM (Fombrun et al., 2000), which has been validated by prior
 research (Fombrun et al., 2015) and measures on four core areas as
 trust, esteem, admire, and good feeling (Chan et al., 2018) to the
 Indian context to see its applicability is a very good strategy. The
 author also contributes to this scale by adding components from the
 Indian context. I believe this can be highlighted in the intro and
 conclusions sections.

*Thank you for your observation and for seeing merit in our approach. We have better highlighted this contribution, as suggested.*

1. The RQ3) What are the consequences of a good reputation? – seems to be
 too general and needs to be reformulated to match the specific sample
 group and context of the study. So it could read as: RQ3) What are the
 consequences of a good reputation for employees from the Indian context?

*Thank you and we agree. The question has been modified as per your suggestion.*

1. I have some issues with the methodology section and some more
 explanations could help resolve them. The authors use a sample of 140
 executive management students – not a very relevant sample for this
 study and what is the exact reason for choosing them to reveal
 reputation components needs to be explained better. Also from which
 school are these executive MBA students from and when was this study
 conducted – more details are needed as to the mechanics of that study.
 Pilot study administered to - small sample of 30 middle-level employees
 from Bombay Stock Exchange (BSE), India 500 companies. – when and how - again more specifics are needed.

*Thank you for the observation. We have addressed all these points in the research methodology section and highlighted the same.*

1. A structured questionnaire was administered to middle management
 employees – when was this done and how was the survey administered? A
 sample of the scale/questions used could be provided. In general, more
 specifics needed
 Questionnaires were administered both personally and through email – who
 conducted the surveys – what was the incentive for filling them out?
 What was the information they received – this could be added to the
 appendix of the manuscript.

*Thank you. These details have been added to the Research Methodology section. A copy of the questionnaire has been included as Annexure.*

1. I find the concept of Company ethos, which is related to company
 personality, quite important and interesting. The authors state: “The
 personification of a company facilitates linking and understanding of
 the target concept with another notion or concept with which there is
 more or greater familiarity (Morgan, 1983). Similar to the personification metaphor approach for CR used by Davies et al. (2001),company ethos was construed as including factors related to the personality of the company as agreeable, enterprise and competence.”(p.22)– but on the scale for company ethos it seems that the authors only used two terms - Adapts to emerging trends and Is consistent in its
 approach – so how do they come up with the terms - the personality of
 the company as agreeable, enterprise and competence? This needs to be
 clarified. I think this is an important contribution of the manuscript
 and needs further explication.

*Thank you. The metaphors proposed by Aaker (1997) -sincerity and competency are a much better fit. We have made the changes and highlighted the same in the paper.*

1. I liked Figure 1: LEEC –Supportive Behavior of Employees – and the
 linkages between the Driver attributes and supportive behavior presented
 there. I think the authors can provide a brief explanation of the figure
 in the text – like a brief introduction. Also, the contribution of this
 study can be highlighted in the figure as well to make it visually
 evident to readers.

*Thank you. A brief introduction to the figure has been provided in the paper on page 22. The diagram has been modified to make it visually evident to the readers on page 23. Again on page 24, relationships presented in the diagram are deliberated upon.*

1. On pg. 29 the authors wrote – “Further, the focus of employees on
 stakeholder relationship, customer centricity and company ethos should
 propel companies to consider building focus on stakeholders with
 specific focus on customers, and company ethos.” – perhaps providing
 specific suggestions for what can be done to emphasize company ethos
 could help enhance the implications of the study.

*Thank you. On page 30 we have shared suggestions on enhancing culture and company ethos for building connects with the employees.*

1. The conclusions section seems to be too brief and almost like a summary
 of the findings. I believe it can be expanded to link the main findings
 of the study to the extant literature and provide suggestions for future
 studies. It also needs to address study limitations.

*Thanks. We have further deliberated on the section, linked it to existing research and also reworked on the sections of theoretical and practical implications and limitations of the study (pages 27-31).*

Once again, we very much appreciate the helpful reviewer comments. We believe our revised manuscript is stronger for it.