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| Report on how reviewers comments were addressed  **Manuscript title**:Perceptions of factors influencing the career success of professional and business women in South Africa  **(Note: We have made a slight amendment to the title)** | |
| 1. General comments: (Any comments of a general nature including language, readability, references used or technical aspects) |
| Readability: The manuscript was largely rewritten to connect and clarify arguments.  Referencing: Adjustments were made to the referencing according to SAJEMS standards.  Language Editing: the manuscript was language edited by a professional language editor |

|  |
| --- |
| 2. Abstract: (Does the abstract reflect the essence of the manuscript?) |
| The abstract was rewritten to clarify the objective of the study. All the tracked comments were taken into consideration in the reformulation. |

|  |
| --- |
| 3. Body: (Does layout of the manuscript enable the reader to ‘follow the story line’) |
| Topics, as per suggestion, were incorporated into one.  The body was expanded, also with regard the methodology and findings sections as suggested.  Reviewer A suggested that we remove the left hand box (showing the success groups) from Figure 1. The authors feel that the box provides a visual image from the onset of the categorised success groups for the employment of discriminant analysis that will be discussed in the paper. If we remove it the framework will exclude an important variable. |

|  |
| --- |
| 4. Originality: (Does the manuscript contain adequate new information to justify it publication in an ISI indexed journal) |
| The section on findings was expanded and further analysis incorporated through step-wise discriminant analysis (Table 6). |

|  |
| --- |
| 5. Relationship to literature: (Does the manuscript demonstrate an adequate understanding of relevant literature? Are appropriate sources cited?) |
| The literature review was revised in accordance with the reviewers’ comments.  The BWA figures were updated to 2012 throughout. |

|  |
| --- |
| 6. Research methodology: (Is the manuscript’s argument founded on an appropriate base of theory, concepts or other ideas? Is the research on which the manuscript is based, well designed and are the methods employed appropriate?) |
| This section was substantially expanded and clarified according to reviewers’ comments. It now shows how the ten universities and various organisations assisted in the data collection. The nature of respondents and methods of data analyses are clarified.  The questionnaire design is clearly illustrated in Table 4, indicating how the various variables and constructs in the framework were measured. |

|  |
| --- |
| 7. Results: (Are the results presented clearly and analysed appropriately, and do the conclusions adequately tie all the elements of manuscript together?) |
| This section has been largely amended to address reviewers’ comments. The section starts with descriptive statistics and describes some sample characteristics as suggested. Assumptions have been removed. The split in sample has been written in paragraph format for a better understanding. Results of advanced statistics have been expanded to better explain the variables which discriminate between the two groups of women. The results confirm that the suggested research framework of factors influencing career success needed no adjustments. The authors therefore did not put an updated framework in the findings (as suggested by Reviewer A). |

**Final comment**

We would like to extend our sincere appreciation to the reviewers for their time and effort in providing very valuable comments, enabling us to improve on the manuscript. All tracked changes and comments have been addressed in our revised submission.