Dear Editors,

Thank you for your recent review of our manuscript. We appreciate the comments and helpful suggestions, which we think will enhance the paper. We have made some revisions to the manuscript based on the comments, which are evident through the use of track changes. We have also indicated the revisions in a point-for-point response to each comment below. We feel we have addressed all your concerns and hope you will now find this manuscript suitable for publication and inclusion in the “Back to Basics” issue of *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly.*

**GUEST EDITORS COMMENTS**

*1. Please go ahead and accept all track changes*

**Response:** Done.

*2. Abstract, lines 15/16: Please remove “technical services” – we wanted it to be broader for all LIS*

*students/librarians.*

**Response:** Done.

*3. Introduction, line 42/43: After the Taylor and Joudrey quote, we suggest you add one sentence with a clear, straightforward description of authority control and its importance. For example, “Authority control helps users by bringing together all items in a library catalog with the same author, title, or subject…” “Catalogers assign one consistent form of a name, title, or subject to bring together all items in a library catalog…” Or something like that.*

**Response:** Thank you for the suggestion. We have added a sentence that we feel concisely explains what authority control is while also illustrating how it helps users.

*4. P. 2, lines 21-28: The sentence after the Clack quote is a little confusing. We suggest you make it more straightforward. Instead of “library database” say “library catalog”; say “bibliographic records” instead of “descriptive (or bibliographic) records” etc.*

**Response:** We have simplified the language in this sentence, as suggested.

*5. P. 2, lines 33/34: Instead of “select” perhaps use “find”? When you use the word “select” in the discussion creating bibliographic records, it makes it seems like catalogers make up access points when cataloging. Using “select” when discussing actually creating the authorized access points/authority records makes sense.*

**Response:** We appreciate your drawing our attention to the nuance of this word choice and have opted to use the word “find” here, as suggested.

*6. Introduction/Definition sections (e.g., P. 5, “Authority control is a set of processes paragraph”): We suggest you make it clear what happens during the creation of a bibliographic record (finding and assigning authorized access points) as opposed to authority work done to create the authorized access points. It seems a little blurred together.*

**Response:** In the third paragraph of the Introduction, a sentence has been revised to make it clear that this paragraph is talking about authority work as opposed to the finding/assigning of access points that is done with bibliographic records that is described in the previous paragraph. “When catalogers create or revise authorized access points, they must ensure each access point’s uniqueness…” In the Authority Control Defined section, we added an explanation and example of finding and assigning an access point in a bibliographic record.

*7. Also, in the above paragraph on P. 5, the discussion makes it seem like the formulation and recording of authorized access points is the sole focus of authority control. This leaves out the formulation and recording of variant access points, which is also part of authority control. An example of an authorized access point and a variant access point would be helpful for those who are not familiar with these concepts.*

**Response:** We have added variants as something that is done in authority work and have included an example.

*8. P. 5, line 17: a closing square bracket is missing.*

**Response:** We have added the missing closing bracket.

*9. P. 6, line 38: in the reviewer comments on your last version, it was mentioned that “discovered” is not the best word to use here. Just use “developed.”*

**Response:** We intended to accept this suggestion the first time around and made the edit but it somehow did not make it to the final version of the submission. Our apologies for the oversight.

*10. P. 7, first paragraph: this paragraph jumps very quickly from event to event. In particular, Cutter’s Objects and Means is mentioned, but there is no explanation regarding why it is important in the history of authority control. It would be better to move your discussion of its importance here rather than mentioning it in the Paris Principles discussion.*

**Response:** We have moved the explanation of the importance of Cutter’s Objects and Means to where we first introduce the concept.

*11. P. 7, line 17: Spell out LC the first time you use it.*

**Response:** Thanks for catching that. We have spelled it out here and then abbreviated it to LC in the following instances.

*12. P. 7, line 49: should be Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules (AACR2) - add a “u” to Cataloging.*

**Response:** We appreciate you point out this spelling error. We have fixed the typo.

*13. P. 7-8: Sentence that starts with “Where previous cataloging rules did not explicitly address authority control practices...” You just said earlier in this paragraph that ALA developed rules in the 1940s related to authority control.*

**Response:** We have revised the sentence to not compare AACR2 to previous rules.

*14. P. 8, lines 33/34: Spell out IFLA the first time you use it.*

**Response:** We have spelled it out here and then abbreviated to IFLA in the following instances.

*15. P. 8, FRBR discussion: you are actually discussing FRAD when you mention person, family, and corporate body. FRBR Group 2 entities are Person and Corporate Body. Group 1 is Work, Expression, Manifestation, Item. Honestly, perhaps you could mention FRAD, too, but remove the specific entities. Their inclusion in original RDA is more important. Also, they (along with FRSAD) have been combined into the LRM, which is being included into Revised RDA. This is worth mentioning here, too, if only in a sentence.*

**Response:** You are correct. We have revised this section to include FRAD and FRSAD in addition to FRBR and omitted the specific entity types. We also added a statement about LRM being used as the basis for a revised RDA.

*16. P. 10, first full paragraph of Metadata content standards for authority records section: Instead of saying “guidelines and instructions,” just say “guidelines” since that is the word you use throughout this section and their meanings are very similar. Also, you say “...well-formed bibliographic and authority metadata.” What does this mean? “Well-formed” is usually used in the context of syntax within encoding schemes, especially in XML. It is unclear what it means in the context of your paper.*

**Response:** We removed “instructions” to just say “guidelines.” We agree that “well-formed” can be confusing. We revised this to say “consistent and accurate.”

*17. P. 10, line 52: change “person names” to “personal names.”*

**Response:** We have replaced “person names” with “personal names.”

*18. P. 17, lines 44-45: Please add the word “authority” before “records” and after “batch loading”*

**Response:** Done.

*19. P. 18, lines 5-6: Instead of “using the authorized access point” say “using authorized access points”*

**Response:** Done.

*20. P. 18-19 and figures 6-7: Discussion of Geisel: The dates in the authorized heading in NAF are 1904-1991, so we suggest you be consistent in all places. Please close out those dates in all places. It would be too confusing for students. The 663 note on Dr. Seuss is problematic because it isn’t closed out in NAF, so maybe add [1991] or something?*

**Response:** We closed the dates for Theodor Geisel in the text and in figures 6 and 7. We also closed off dates for other names used in these figures.

*21. P. 25, lines 45-52: The sentence, “The use of lexical…” could be clearer? What are you trying to say? Is it keyword searching that is driving the development of facets? Also, could you move the definition of “facets” into the narrative rather than putting it in an endnote?*

**Response:** We revised the sentence to be more direct in saying that keyword searching is driving the adoption of facets. We also brought the definition of facets from the endnotes into the body of the paper.

*22. P. 27-28, Linked Data section: since linked data was mentioned multiple times in previous sections, the flow would be better if this section preceded the Federated Authority Databases section.*

**Response:** We moved the Linked Data section as suggested.

*23. P. 28, lines 8-13: Should it be recent updates to RDA?*

**Response:** We modified this to just say RDA.

*24. P. 30-31:* *Discussion of illegal aliens: We suggest you rephrase. LC \*can’t\* change it because of Congress. It reads as if LC is deliberately not making this change. You may want to revise and condense this section. Also, it is important to note that \*some\* people find illegal aliens problematic - not everyone. It would be helpful to add a bit more context - that is it a term in the US legal code, and why some people feel that the heading is problematic.*

**Response:** We have revised and condensed the discussion about the illegal aliens subject term. While still condensing the narrative surrounding the change proposal, we have added context both for why some people feel the term needs to change and why LC has not been able to do so.

*25. P. 31, lines 54/55: Please move the URL into an endnote.*

**Response:** Done.