### Reviewer 1

**Comment 1**  
The paper mostly relies on descriptive summaries. The statistical methods and data analyses summarized are suitable and sound. Yet I have a few comments that need to be addressed to improve the statistical presentation, as indicated below:

- Pages 4-5, “Variables” sections: The terminology “independent” variables should be avoided, since the authors do not seem to define any concept of “independence.” When this refers to a linear regression model or ANOVA, the terminology “explanatory” variables can be used. Generally, the explanatory variables are not strictly independent variables. Similarly, instead of “dependent” variable, the terminology “response” or “outcome” variable should be used for the same reasons.

- Page(s) 15-16, Table(s) 1-2: The test upon which each p-value is based should be stated in a footnote to the table. A p-value without associated statistical test cannot be interpreted.

**Response 1**  
Thank you very much for your comments. The manuscript has been revised accordingly. Please see page 4, paragraphs 1 and 2.

**Comment 2**  
- Page(s) 15-16, Table(s) 1-2: The test upon which each p-value is based should be stated in a footnote to the table. A p-value without associated statistical test cannot be interpreted.

**Response 2**  
We have provided the type of test conducted as footnote to Tables 1 and 2.

### Reviewer 2

**Comment 1**  
Dear author/s  
This is a well written study that includes an important examination of county characteristics as "predictors" to becoming a Magnet hospital. A good job was done in covering the literature and the sample size is large and allows the multi-variables analyses that were conducted.  
Yet, I have few suggestions to improve this manuscript:  
1. Can the authors clarify how this was a cross sectional secondary data analysis if the data regarding the ranking was obtained from 2010 to 2019?

**Response 1**  
Thank you for your comment. We indicated that this is a cross sectional study as we aggregated measures from 2010-2014 and after 2014. So, our explanatory variables are identified at one point time interval and our outcome is identified at a separate time interval. We have sought to clarify that we aggregated measures in the Methods section under 3.7 Explanatory variables and 3.8 Control variables on page 4, paragraphs 2 and 3.

**Comment 2**  
2. In line with this comment, how did this independent variable was calculated to create the weighted score? If the ranking is annually, there were 9 different rankings.

**Response 2**  
Thank you for pointing this out. We have added this information to section 3.7. In short, we averaged the ranks for each domain between 2010 and 2014. Additionally, we added a brief
description on how the domains and weights were collected through the County Health Rankings and Roadmaps dataset. This additional text is located on page 4, paragraph 2.

**Comment 3**
3. If the data is cross sectional, please avoid using the term – impact which serves to present causality which a cross sectional study cannot claim.

**Response 3**
Thank you. We appreciate the comment and changes are reflected throughout the revised manuscript.

**Comment 4**
4. Please specify the rational for the three models that were conducted.

**Response 4**
Thank you for the suggestion. On page 5 under section 3.9 (paragraph 1) we added the following: “Three separate models were assessed. Each model included different combinations of the County Health Rankings domains. Evaluating each combination is necessary to determine if domains associated with health outcomes, health factors or the combination better fit the data.”

**Reviewer 3**

**Comment 1**
Comments to the Author
Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript exploring the relationship between socio-economic indicators and hospital Magnet status. The paper is well written and nicely demonstrates that disparities between community health and wealth impact organisations’ capacity to prepare for and achieve Magnet status.

I have some minor comments for the authors.
- Consider using the CHEERS (Economic evaluation of health interventions) checklist

**Response 1**
Thank you for the recommendation. Based on the nature of our study, we have carefully completed the STROBE guidelines as required by the JAN. Please see attachment.

**Comment 2**
- The paper is US-centric, how do your findings relate to the global community?

**Response 2**
We appreciate your comment, thank you. Please see page 9, paragraph 1 and page 9, paragraph 4.

**Comment 3**
- Please check carefully for typos.
Altogether an interesting study.

**Response 3**
Thank you. We have carefully revised the manuscript to reflect the comments.