I would like to thank the reviewer for their effort and useful comments. Below please find my response to these comments.

Reviewer: 1

Comments:

This paper examined employee attitudes towards the loss of information. The study was carried out using semi-structured interviews with 15 employees

The authors seem to have done some good research in a very important topic, however were not able to communicate that through writing and discussion.!

The discussion section was revised. I hope it is better now.

Unfortunately, writing and formatting of the article are not suitable, and required more efforts to refinement. The overall paper needs to be rewritten

I did my best to fix it.

The problem of the study is not clear

I tried to clarify the problem better by stating it at the beginning of the article on the abstract section and later on the discussion.

The purpose of the study was to examine employee perceptions regarding loss of information. What was the significance for them of the information they kept and used, and how did they feel about the possibility of losing it?

In addition to the lack of clarity of the problem - the questions posed by the article is not measurable

In the methodology section (pp 9-10), I have described in more detail the chosen research method (qualitative research) and its purpose. On p. 24 there are suggestions for future research which involve other methods like survey or mixed method which can help understand employees' attitudes and perceptions about the value of their information and what influences their perception regarding its loss in a more measurable way

Reviewer: 2

Comments:

The paper starts off with a useful look into related theories about the connection between our digital/external and internal selves. It also talks about the importance of email in today's workplaces. There is a large amount of research published in the area of personal information management (PIM); I am not extremely familiar with all of it, but there might more in the body of literature that would be worth citing in the lit review.

Throughout the revision process I added several PIM articles. They are marked in red color on the reference section

The theories used here are important - I am also thinking about approaches such as phenomenology (Merleau-Ponty) - but this may or may not be a tangent for you.

Indeed, I used the phenomenological approach. In the methodology section (pp. 9), I describes in more details the research method I used and why.

I have questions about the data analysis. Despite the use of metaphors noted as part of your approach, it is not enough to say the transcripts were "analyzed to extract key themes" - be more specific (content analysis, thematic analysis...?) Clarifying this and making sure you have applied it might then further structure your findings around the themes.

On p. 10 (methodology section) I tried to clarify the analysis method I used (thematic analysis) and restructured the finding section (pp.10-18) according to the themes that arose.

You discussed the extended self theory in the Discussion section and said it "contributes insights", but how does this research relate to it more specifically? It possibly demonstrates it, but does it further expand/build/verify it in some meaningful way?

This paragraph was not written correctly. I rephrased it more modestly on the significance section (p. 22).

I am also wondering what could be added to discuss practical implications. What can be done on both individual and organisational levels to try to avoid this kind of disaster in terms of server backups and PIM practices, for example?

Practical implications in the forms of backup policy and PIM practices training were added as suggested to the significance of the research section (p.22) and again in the conclusion (p.24).

I think if these points can be considered and addressed, it could be a useful paper.

Thank you

Reviewer: 3

Comments:

I like this work. Mostly, I find the work is interesting.

First, the use of theory is quite intriguing in that privacy work rarely used “self-extension” perspective. Second, qualitative insights are interesting as well, given people’s words are quite indicative of how important privacy is even at the organizational setting. And this could be bringing many more implications.

Still, I have some reservations before I fully recommend this work.

First, it is very strange to see the article ends with a bunch of questions. I know what the authors’ intention would be, but please write to conclude the entire work, instead of posing questions.

This section was rewritten. A conclusion was added at the end of the article (p. 24).

Second, the references are quite missing.

I see authors rely on many extraneous sources, which is fine. But recently, more works got published and those works will help the authors advance their thesis more clearly. See the work below – one is more about privacy of political expression in social media: We can imagine how this work can be significantly related to the current work.

Park, Yong Jin. "Social antecedents and consequences of political privacy." New Media & Society 20.7 (2018): 2352-2369.

Also the work below suggests a fundamental point about how digital ecosystem might introduce challenges --- surely tied to organizational setting under the current study.

Park, Y. J., Chung, J. E., & Shin, D. H. (2018). The Structuration of Digital Ecosystem, Privacy, and Big Data Intelligence. American Behavioral Scientist, 62(10), 1319-1337.

Finally, please see the work by Chen et al. This work specifically deals with organizational setting and privacy-related issues.

Chen, W., Huang, G., Miller, J., Lee, K. H., Mauro, D., Stephens, B., & Li, X. (2018). “As We Grow, It Will Become a Priority”: American Mobile Start-Ups’ Privacy Practices. American Behavioral Scientist, 62(10), 1338-1355.

While I understand how privacy matters can influence employees' perception regarding their information loss, in the present study, this issue was not raised by employees as one of the main themes, therefore I did not elaborate on this issue. Still, reading the above articles gave me an idea about the perception of digital possession as forming identity from the perspective of companies and organizations. I referred to this idea on the theoretical background section (p. 7)

In terms of presentation, I would rather want to see some thematic organization in the result section. I see it was attempted, yet it will be very helpful if this work can be organized even more clearly. For instance, under the general theory of "self“extension”, I wanted to see more clear development of sub-themes that are tightly linked back to the notion of self-extension. This way, readers would remember the general findings even more quickly and appreciate the authors’ work.

Revisions have been made accordingly. The finding section (pp. 10-18) was restructured according to the thematic analysis and an introduction at the beginning of this section was added, describing how one theme lead to the other and how it is linked to the notion of self-extension.

On page 8, we see this:

The purpose of this study was to examine employee perceptions regarding loss of

information. What was the significance for them of the information they kept and used, and

how did they feel about the possibility of losing it?

This is too short, came too late, and needs to be moved up front so that readers can clearly see what will happen in the article.

Also, please tie this question to the theory this article is relying on. Without those connections, we will see this lacks theoretical depth.

At the beginning of the article I added a paragraph explaining the purpose of the study and its connection to the theory. (p. 3)

Methodology sections, it says

Metaphors express people’s unconscious

reaction to certain issues

But I do not seem to find clear metaphorical expressions used by interviewees. Please clarify where and how these metaphors occur in their accounts.

By metaphorical expressions I was referring to the way some participants completed the sentence: "losing information is like…" I tried to clarify this in section 4.5: Information as part of the body (p. 17).

In terms of limits, the authors should do even better jobs. First, the sample size is enormously limited. Second, selection of sample organization is never mentioned. Surely, type of organization will affect findings. Third, because there was no analysis of a privacy-related critical event which may have occurred before interview, we would never know how the shaping of their perceptions may have occurred. This can be measured and detected by survey works or more mixed methodology approach. I think the authors should discuss this for future research as well as for their limitations.

Research limitation section was rewritten. I described the organization in general as a research organization to preserve the anonymity of the interviewees. It gives a sense of the nature of the organization. Explanation for the sample size was given.

Future research was corrected according to the above comment.

Still, I find this work is interesting and with appropriate revision as recommended above, this work might deserve a spot in the journal.

Thank you