**Answer to the Article**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Page | Answer | Not |  |  |
| P.17  P.18  P.19 | Updated the Findings Reference to the quantitative part | Statistical analysis of results are weak, need to be more robust! | 1 | Reviewer 1 |
| P.27 | Added references | Most of the references are outdated with the exception of two 2016 and 2017 papers. Need to update the references. | 2 |
| P.15 | Topic Add Article | If this is so, then institutional theory’s concerns with coercive or normative isomorphism might suggest why quality engineering spread (governments mandated it and “good organizations” had them as a result). Then, in order to shelter the core activities of organizations from these institutional pressures, quality engineering was only loosely coupled with everything else – hence the relative lack of authority. | 3 | Reviewer 2 |
| P.23 | Topic Add Article | The other possibility the author(s) resort to near the end of the paper is Giddens’ concept of structuration. This could work but it is also might be less effective. Quality engineers could be structurally stuck in roles peripheral to actual organization activities and that would be “structuration”. They could also be totally integrated into the organizational apparatus, etc. and that could be “structuration.” Presumably, the occupational group would prefer the latter. | 4 |
| P.17  P.18  P.19 | Updated the FindingsReference to the quantitative part | you have seven interviews and surveys from 90 quality engineers, but there is no quantitative analysis actually presented. Even if the results could be presented as simple descriptive statistics, that would be worth knowing. As it stands now, it isn’t clear exactly what is being analyzed and what isn.t | 5 |
| P.24 | **Add section** Limitations and practical implications | If the first and second points above could be cleared up, the conclusion could focus on what the next steps are for the professional group | 6 |