|  |
| --- |
| Dear Prof. Bytheway,Thank you for accepting our submission for the “CI Research Methods.”Below is a summary of our amendments addressing the comments from both reviewers.Hossana & Roy**Changes made according to reviewers recommendations** |
|  |  |
| **Reviewer1.Comment** | **Response** |
| R1.1: This article tries to 'sell' QMS - but fails to produce evidence ( in its analysis of the two articles) that the same outcome would not be achieved by any other form of 'meta-data analysis' | The reviewer is correct in the attempt to sell QMS as a valid and necessary tool today. |
| R1.2: Sentence incomplete - Does not make sense | Sentence was modified. |
| R1.3: What is the actual research about, before outcomes is addressed  | Sentence was modified. |
| R1.4: No abbreviations in abstract | Corrected. |
| R1.5: some issues in the introduction can be moved to the respective subheadings  | Yes, some issues could be moved, but we felt this was a better fit for those that do not read the entire article. |
| R1.6: reference  | We have cited (Harris, 1975) from his paper, “On comparing theories”. |
| R1.7: is the view on one researcher enough to substantiate such a strong view; or is the researcher merely “panel beating” information out there to support his/her own subjective nuances / views / preference for QMS? | We believe that the view of Detmar W. Straub is plausible enough to substantiate a substantiated view. He is one of the most published and cited researches in the IS World:Citations 33,945h-index 54i10-index 112Detmar Straub has also for a long time been the Senior Editor for MIS Quartely, IS’s leading journal. His life works are on theory building tools. We therefore infer his papers are quite authoritative on the subject of theory building. |
| R1.8: Outdated reference/s | The historical reference reflects the length of need. We have also added a new contemporary reference Webster (2014) which reflects even further the heightened need. |
| R1.9: . The contextual importance of community informatics should be situated earlier in the writing. | Reference removed. |
| R1.10: how are the studies used to generate theory/s chosen - i.e. does QMS allow for the evaluation of 'good and/or bad research' | Good question. Yes, QMS does allow for “good and bad research”. Guideline 2 and 4 incorporate the issue of quality of the qualitative analysis. The guidelines also give recommendations on how to make the good/bad judgement more objectively. Further, Peer Reviewed Research is deemed “Good Research” and therefore the comparison of such research “could” result in theory development. We do however acknowledge that “peer review” may have some shortcomings. |
| R1.11: first give the full concept and then introduce abbreviation | Done |
| R1.12: reference | Done. |
| R1.13: alert reader to the various comparisons that follow | Done. |
| R1.14: no abbreviations in headings | Done. |
| R1.15: two unique sentences in one long paragraph. | Done |
| R1.16: A comparitive table indicating the various differences will be useful to the reader. | Good suggestion for a future paper, but this paper exceeds 8,000 words already. |
| R1.17: no evidence indicated in the writing on the evaluation of QMS; why should any reader take note of the recommendations of QMS as a useful tool... | We are not challenging [Scruggs *et al.*, 2006](#_ENREF_36). We have included the words… “ *which we challenge*” |
| R1.18: reference | Updated to a statement. |
| R1.19: evidence? | We provide the evidence in a later part of the paper. |
| R1.20: namely? | … influence of a researchers own situatedness … |
| R1.21: reference? | Reference added (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005) |
| R1.22: is the word 'guidelines' used to steer away from the idea of a 'theory' being proposed before it was suitably tested? | We were not certain what term the reviewer would like … Aggregated Approach 1: Plan? |
| R1.23: trialed and tested to give this guidelines its credibility?? | These guidelines are proposed and illustrated with two examples. |
| R1.24: word missing | Done. |
| R1.26: How is this a problem or not? | It is a problem especially for policy makers who prefer “determinate” results and have little appreciation for diversity of opinion. |
| R1.27: Is this not an indication of bad research rather than the significance of QMS | Indeed, it is an indication of bad research. QMS is forced to make a decision on the quality of the research. This is what you mention ealier. |
| R1.28: this critique applies to the existing writing as well? | Correct comment. As collegial academics, for the sake of academic politeness, we try to steer away from saying Siau and Long did QMS badly - bad research really.  |
| R1.29: How does this fit with the particular aim of that study? | By ignoring difference in the constituent studies, Siau and Long did bad research. In QMS, we do not ignore differences, we report the differences. It is from such reporting that new understandings are actually derived. This appreciation of diversity is fundamental to qualitative research. |
| R1.30: what evidence are there that these studies used as examples to illustrate the effectiveness of QMS was not 'bad research' to begin with. | This is a valid and insightful comment. Lee used QMS almost well enough. Siau and Long did not. This is in fact the reason we developed this paper. We are concerned that other academics can mis-use this beautiful method. By proposing guidelines, we are able to determine whether QMS has been done well. We also enable other researcher to do good research using QMS. |
|  |  |
| **Reviewer2.Comment** | **Response** |
| R2.1: Formatting issues: titles should be numbered | Done. |
| R2.2: In the first line, Information Systems must be written and his acronym defined. Abstract, where it is defined, is not part of the text. | Done. |
| R2.3: 3rd paragraph of Introduction: In my opinion, research has advanced to a point where it can face problems considering his whole complexity. But the problems have always been complex and needed multidisciplinary > approaches. | Incorporated. |
| R2.4: The last paragraph of Introduction does not reflect the text order (which is very good). Just fix this paragraph | Corrected. |
| R2.5: In Guideline 3, you announce two reflexive methods, but list three. | Corrected. |
| R2.6: This paper deserved a more carefully written conclusions section. For example, the inconsistencies cited in the abstract do not appear in the conclusions, as any word about your experiment. | Thanks, the conclusion section has been redone. |
| R2.7: The correct reference for Lee (2010) | Corrected. |
| R2.8: I must say that it is very frustrating to base a research on a paper that costs R$41.95, specially on an Open Journal as JoCI | We have not quite understood this comment. |