**Answering to the review of the paper “Minimal critical specification of a change process design: The participatory transformation of a system for material logistics”**

Reviewers asked for major revisions. In the following are given the main comments, and how the comments have been replied to

* *introduction section does not position the paper within an obvious discussion. The authors do not argue or explain why they selected the STS principle MCS and the concept of domestication approach. Why not use other organizational change principle such as design thinking etc.? A suggestion to problem of positioning might be to further develop section 3 page 3 (starts with “The purpose of project management …”).*

REPLY: there has now been established an argument to position the problem statement, and why MCS/domestication/AR has been chosen as key theoretical concepts; why these are well situated to in the actual setting (the need for a theoretical model that a) allows structural space for open end, b) is able to explain how a local system incorporates an import into itself and c) offers an account of how an organization may allow for diversity and participaton in its acting)

* *RQ:. problem statement is written rather confusing. In the sentences they use both problem statement (which is often used a way to addresses a more overall or general theme/problem) and research question. A research question is much more precise, aimed to direct the research process in a certain direction that limits its relevancy of its findings*
* *problem statement is too broad*

REPLY: the whole section has been totally revised, less focus on the general setting, and included is a more precise RQ

* *methodology section could be improved*

REPLY: the section has been reworked and revised, arguing more accurately about the AR design/setup, and accounting better for logic behind the theoretical model, the fieldwork and the case as experiment

* *paper appears very descriptive and lack more thorough analysis linking back to theoretical concepts, strengths and weaknesses of the MCS approach and different aspects of «domestication». / the ending does not discuss properly findings and the contribution of the paper*

REPLY: In both Findings and Conclusion, a more comprehensive analysis is carried out based on the theoretical model developed in the theory section, discussing the intersection of MCS, domestication and dialogical aspects of action research.

* *too many discussions cramped into one paper*

REPLY: the account of Norwegian IR system has been omitted. So has the Lean discussion. This has allowed a more thorough focus on the concepts central to the RQ

* *In the end of the chapter «The initial preparatory analysis of the installation work process» (p. 10) there seems to be some text missing*

REPLY: the noted point has been fixed and the text in general has been to a rather thorough revision.

* *hard to understand what came out of the analysis based on the «five generic lean principles» used as a guideline for the analysis of the logistics system.*

REPLY: the role of the lean principles has been omitted, and the analysis results is now presented as a table aligned with the result table used later

* *does not follow author guidelines for style and length of abstract*

REPLY: the abstract has been shortened and sharpened, in line with journal’s recipe – contains now 210 words